

# THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

## REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. XXI.

*SEPTEMBER, 1828.*

### CATHOLICS AND DISSENTERS.

It is evident that a very considerable change, a change partly of opinion and yet more of feeling, has taken place among the Dissenters of England, upon the Catholic Question. Many who were hostile have become friendly to the full concession of political rights to Roman Catholics; and those who are friendly have a stronger impression of the importance of the subject, and of the duty and the necessity of promoting a right view of it in the public mind, and a speedy and satisfactory decision of it by the Legislature. The indications of this change may be seen abundantly in the public acts and public meetings of different bodies of Dissenters: in the number of congregational petitions for the repeal of Catholic disabilities, which they have presented to Parliament during the last two or three sessions; in the direct or implied recognition of the justice of the Catholic claims, which was included in a very large proportion of the petitions for the removal of their own grievances by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts; in the resolutions passed and published in various places on the obtaining of that repeal, and of which few were silent about, and none unfriendly to, the Roman Catholics; in yet stronger demonstrations of feeling at public meetings, as at the anniversary of the Protestant Society, when on Lord Holland's reminding them that he became their advocate on condition of their advocating the cause of others involved in similar degradation, the whole assembly rose, as one man, replying to his appeal with an enthusiasm which those who witnessed will not soon forget; and, above all, in the proceedings at the Commemorative Festival, on the eighteenth of June, when the *élite* of the Dissenting body, its not unworthy representatives in station, wealth, and influence, and, what is far more important, in talent, character, and principle, became responsible to our legislative and princely advocates, to the Catholics of Ireland, to the people of Great Britain, to the Christian and civilized world, for our consistent adherence to the cause of religious liberty, for our active promotion of it until no man is legally injured, in whatever shape the injury may be inflicted, on account of his religious creed, of whatever propositions or negations it may consist. There is enough in these occurrences to satisfy us of the general soundness of the Dissenters upon this subject, so far as Dissenters are of much importance in the State. At the same time it must be acknowledged, and it is deeply to be regretted, that among the

less informed classes of them there is probably a large majority by whom different sentiments are cherished, and who have a traditional horror of Popery which obscures their perception of expediency, and even their sense of justice. Even these classes, however, are becoming more enlightened, and it may be added to the favourable symptoms which have been enumerated, that their leaders are in a state of alarm, and are attempting to raise a cry of danger to the Protestant Cause and the British Constitution. Such is the object of a pamphlet recently published by Mr. Ivimey, a Particular Baptist Minister, entitled, "The Roman Catholic Claims a Question not of Religious Liberty, but of Political Expediency; an Address to the Protestant Dissenters of Great Britain, assigning Reasons why (in reference to that subject) they should maintain the most strict Neutrality." This pamphlet deserves to be made the subject of a few remarks, not certainly on account of the novelty of its matter, the force of its logic, or the eloquence of its style; but because it embodies, and presents in a tangible shape, some of the more powerful prejudices which yet influence the minds of thousands of our Nonconformist brethren, and prevent an unanimous and decisive assertion, by the Dissenting body, of the great principles of religious liberty without respect of persons or denominations.

It was the proud and merited distinction of Mr. Aspland, at the Dissenters' celebration of their victory, to stand forward as the representative of their talent, information, integrity, firmness, and liberality. Nobly did he acquit himself. And as well has Mr. Ivimey acquitted himself, representing, as *he* does, the ignorance and intolerance of Dissent, the iron and clay feet of the heterogeneous image which oppression had kneaded together. In using the words ignorance and intolerance (the latter only as a consequence of the former), the whole of our censure is conveyed; for the sincerity and conscientiousness of the *Dissenters* who oppose themselves to Catholic Emancipation we firmly believe in, and hold in high respect.

Mr. Ivimey affirms that the Roman Catholics are in possession already of complete religious liberty. He asks, "What impositions are practised towards them? Are they not in possession of the most entire toleration? Are they not at perfect liberty to propagate their sentiments, to build chapels, to establish colleges and schools, and to make proselytes in every part of the kingdom?" He affirms, that "whatever cause of complaint they may think they have in regard to the penal laws, they have none on the score of a want of religious liberty. If they suffer, it is not for conscience' sake."

This is strange language for a Dissenter to hold just now, when from one end of the country to the other his brethren are rejoicing in having successfully asserted their own religious rights. The same questions might have been asked, the same assertions made, as to *their* condition anterior to the repeal of the Test Act. Of them, too, it might have been demanded, with an air of triumph, "For what *rite* of religion, which they observe in their public worship, are they labouring under any legal disability?" And the same reply would have done in both cases—For no particular rite, but for that honest faith which is the root of all external observances, and the abjuration of which is demanded as a passport to place and power. The Catholic cannot take the oaths any more than the Dissenter could take the sacrament. Nay, the former exclusion was by far the most complete; for there may be Dissenters whose consciences do not forbid their occasionally communicating with the Episcopal Church; while there cannot be a Catholic whose conscience will allow him to swear that his own religion is

idolatrous and damnable. Either the Dissenters did not, or the Catholics do still, "suffer for conscience' sake; or else there is one standard of "entire toleration" and "religious liberty" for the one class, and another for the other.

What a pitiful sophism it is, that because Catholic worship is not interrupted, therefore Catholics are not persecuted! The printing of libels is not interrupted; only the libeller is afterwards fined or sent to gaol. Does this prove the "most entire toleration" of libellers? Mr. I. calls the laws in question *penal*. And what is penalty but punishment? And for what is the Catholic punished, but because he is a Catholic? His religion, like felony, makes him incapable of offices of trust and honour; and yet we are told that this is not a question of religious liberty!

And suppose it were not; suppose it were only, what it is allowed to be, "a question of political expediency;" does this demonstrate that the Dissenters of England should feel no interest, exercise no influence, upon its decision? Are they to be quiet because it is *only* a question of national security and peace, of common justice and common humanity? Is the word "politics" a spell which is to make them indifferent whether the spirit and precepts of the gospel be acted upon, or outraged, towards millions of their countrymen and brethren? How much mischief has been done by the currency of the cant phrase, that religion has nothing to do with politics! With mere party politics, with the squabbles of rival factions for power and place, religion has indeed nothing to do; but woe to the community whose rulers and members feel no moral obligation, have no conscience, as to public measures, because they come under the head of politics! Wherever there is a wrong which we can redress, or by our representations can induce others to redress, there religion has to do, and holds our inertness inexcusable. Suppose, when the petition against Negro Slavery was before the Dissenting ministers, some one had said, This is "a question, not of religious liberty, but of political expediency;" "such a subject is no more proper for us, according to the constitution of our society, even to discuss, than would be the political question of a *reform in parliament*! Let us strictly observe the apostolic precept, '*and that ye study to be quiet and mind your own business.*' As a society of Protestant Dissenting ministers, our proper business regards those *religious subjects* which concern our own civil and religious liberties, and not those *political questions* which relate to a class of persons with whom we have no connexion." (P. 38.) With what honest indignation would Mr. Ivimey have spurned the selfish plea! He would have declared, with a voice of thunder, that we had the "connexion" of a common nature and a common Saviour with the oppressed African; that to relieve his sufferings and redress his wrongs and promote his happiness was "our own business;" and he would have been right. His qualms about the propriety of "offering advice to Parliament in regard to the laws for governing Ireland,"\* have never affected him when the question has been about what may be just as properly termed "offering advice to Parliament in regard to the laws for governing" the West Indies. And why? Not that the Slavery question can in any way be shewn to be one of *religious* liberty, or that it is not much more simply political than the Catholic; but because, in this case, his theological antipathies do not interfere with his humane feelings; because he hates the Catholics, and he does not hate the Negroes. They,

---

\* Letter to the Deputies.



poor creatures, have, we fear, little godliness or love to the Deity in them ; but it is in relation to the Catholics that he demands of every Dissenter, "SHOULDST THOU HELP THE UNGODLY, AND LOVE THEM THAT HATE THE LORD?" And but for these antipathies, who could contemplate the dissensions, the immoralities, the miseries, which the penal laws have generated and perpetuated in Ireland, and the fearful results to which they seem to be tending, without being conscious of the most imperative obligation, as a disciple of Him who taught to love our neighbour as ourselves, to do all that can be done for the production of a better state of things ? Call the subject religious, political, or what you will ; here are millions oppressed, degraded, insulted, kept in a state of ceaseless agitation to themselves, and of ceaseless peril to others, at our very doors ; and to interpose, by whatever means we can lawfully and effectually interpose, is our duty to them, to our country, and to our God.

The Catholics, it is said, "submit to the supremacy of the Pope, and therefore owe supreme allegiance to a foreign jurisdiction." This indeed is dwelt upon as comprising the essence of all the reasons for their exclusion. This objection is alike futile, whether we look at fact or theory. The Catholics are not, nor ever have been, traitors to their king and country in any greater proportion than Protestants similarly circumstanced. Nay, they have usually had much more of the passive-obedience principle in them. Till the early part of the last reign, it was the High Church and Tory party, much more than the Papists, that threatened the security of the House of Hanover ; and certainly the supremacy of the Pope did not generate either the American revolution or the Irish rebellion. And do not Dissenters profess to owe "supreme allegiance" to a higher jurisdiction than that of George the Fourth ? Does not Mr. Ivimey call himself a subject of King Jesus ? Has not his allegiance a "*but*" (p. 32) in it for laws which may interfere with what he deems the rights of conscience ? Suppose King, Lords, and Commons, were to make a law opposed to his interpretation of the Scriptures ; would he submit to it, by whatever penalty it might be enforced ? To be sure he would not. He would call his refusal, obeying God rather than man. And so it might be ; but he would be the expositor to himself of the divine will, as the Pope is to the Catholics, and his allegiance would be just as imperfect and divided as he says theirs is. The only difference is, that he believes in his own infallibility, and does not believe in that of the Pope ; they believe in the Pope, and not in Mr. Ivimey. Either living or dead, visible or invisible, a person or a book, in some form or other, there is to all religionists a jurisdiction above that of the temporal authority of the country in which they dwell. "Divided allegiance" may be played off against them all, unless they make gods of their kings.

But the great bugbear of all, among Dissenters, is persecution. It is presumed, that if the Catholics can but obtain eligibility, they will be sure to get power ; and if they can but get power, they will be sure to persecute ; and then away will go the liberties and the lives of Protestants. Probably the difference between eligibility to office and its possession, may, in their present situation, become more obvious to Dissenters. They ought already to have learned that Catholics may have seats in Parliament without necessarily becoming the government of the country. And even if they were, and could convert the King into the bargain, that which was impossible in 1688 would not be effected in 1830 ; the liberties of the people of England would remain in proud security without occasion for one drop of



blood to be shed in their defence; and the only practical consequence would be, that the House of Hanover would follow the House of Stuart.

The Anti-catholic Dissenters do not know the men to whose rights they oppose themselves; do not judge them charitably nor justly. They believe Mr. Ivimey, when he enacts the prophet, and says of the Catholics, "If they were to have political power, they would use it to deprive you of your liberty to worship God according to your consciences." This prediction was made to the Deputies three years ago, in company with another which is now repeated, although it has in the interval been distinctly falsified: "They have not asked for your co-operation: they will not thank you for it." They have since done both. They have done more; they have volunteered their co-operation in our struggle for our own rights. They have assisted us to gain a large addition to those very privileges which we are told they are so anxious to despoil us of altogether. Here are facts against assertions; good works to put in the scale against calumnies.

Of civil liberty, as existing in the English Constitution, the broad foundations were laid, and most of the superstructure raised, by Catholic hands. Nor is there any body of men more distinctly or more solemnly pledged to the great cause of religious liberty, in the amplest sense of the words, than are, at this moment, the Catholics of Ireland.

But, as Mr. Ivimey tells us, most aged persons, among the Independents and Baptists, "still smell the smoke of the martyrs;" and the fumes, no doubt, confuse their brains, dim their perceptions, and disorder their memories. It is hard to get such a scent out of a man's nostrils. Still that smoke ought not to "ascend up for ever and ever," merely to blacken the name of Catholic. It is true they have persecuted; often most bloodily; and at times they have broadly avowed the principle of persecution. Had there been any singularity in this, it might fairly have marked them out for legal jealousy and individual horror. But that principle has been as broadly avowed, and, under the corrupting influence of power, has been as promptly acted upon, by at least almost every other sect. The great founders of the Reformed Churches are deeply implicated in this guilt. They vigorously asserted their own right of private judgment; but they as vigorously resisted that of others. Luther demurred to the capital punishment of heretics, but he maintained that they should be banished, be forced to silence, be confined as madmen. Calvin went further, both in principle and practice; and the murder of Servetus not only illustrated his views, but elicited those of several of the most distinguished of the Reformers. Farell and Bucer, Beza, and Melancthon, expressed their applause of that atrocious deed. Socinus was accessory to the imprisonment of Francis Davides. Cranmer consigned Anabaptists to the stake; and Knox held the Mosaic denunciation of death for idolatry to be applicable to the worship of saints. Episcopacy has its condemning record in our statute-book; in penalties varying from fine to death for worshiping God in other ways than that sanctioned by her authority. It was the intolerance of Episcopacy which peopled America, and threatened to depopulate Scotland. The Solemn League and Covenant of the Presbyterians was the obligation of an oath for the extermination of Popery and Prelacy; and the Westminster Confession, to which their ministers yet subscribe, distinctly recognizes and invokes the power of the civil magistrate to preserve the truth and suppress blasphemies and heresies. The fugitives of the seventeenth century who founded the American States, though driven thither by persecution, with few exceptions,

immediately employed themselves in erecting her throne in the wilderness. And here, not all the policy and power of Cromwell could repress the propensity to intolerance in the then triumphant Puritans. That the sect in power should persecute, is the common course of things; not the peculiar crime of the Catholics. And if they have, in fact, offended more than others, it should be remembered that no others have been so tried; that they have held power in a far higher degree, through a much longer duration, over a vastly more extended region, and had to fight a severer battle for its retention, than any other Christian sect ever had or can have. It should also be remembered that they are now, both for themselves and others, strenuously asserting the principle of religious liberty;\* that full toleration is the order of the day with the great Catholic powers of the Continent; and that the very first legislative declaration of the equal right of all Christians to civil and political offices, was the act of Catholics. For, before Locke had framed his tolerant constitution for Carolina; before Penn had, by his personal authority, established Christian equality in Pennsylvania; before Roger Williams had asserted it in Rhode Island, it had been unanimously enacted in Maryland by the Catholic colonists, who were its original settlers.

It was not our design to go so far as we have been incidentally led to do, into the general merits of the Catholic question. There will not be much more occasion for discussion on that subject. The concession of emancipation will not now admit of any long delay. But it shall not be our fault if the success of that measure be for one instant retarded, or its utility diminished in the slightest degree, by any attempts, whether emanating from rapacious hypocrisy or honest bigotry, to foster that *Odium Theologicum* amongst Dissenters, which ought to be allowed to die the natural death to which it is doomed, and wither with other weeds beneath the light and warmth of the advancing day.

---

ADVICE ON ENTERING THE PROFESSION OF THE LAW: FROM THE ADDRESS OF THE VISITOR (THE REV. W. TURNER) TO THE STUDENTS OF YORK COLLEGE, AFTER THE ANNUAL EXAMINATION ON 26TH JUNE LAST.

It is usual, in taking leave of our young friends who are about to quit the Institution, together with our best wishes, to offer them some advice respecting their conduct in future life. And as the great object of our undertaking is education for the Christian ministry, the advice has naturally been in a good degree confined to the exercise of the important duties connected with the ministerial office. I trust our friends who are now leaving us for the exercise of that profession, will give me full credit for the best wishes on their behalf; more especially, as I feel a sort of personal connexion with some, on the score of long family friendship, and with one on

---

\* So far as it is connected with legislative enactments. The New-Testament doctrine of religious liberty, the right of private judgment *in* the church, is indeed alien from the spirit of their system; but that is unhappily little understood or practised by Dissenters.

the ground of the connexion which he is about to form, as colleague, and also as minister, with some of my nearest and dearest relatives. But as I understand that several of our young lay friends who are leaving us, have for their further object the study of the law, I propose to depart from my usual practice, and (referring those who are about to engage in the ministry to what I have formerly addressed to their predecessors on so many former occasions,\* and particularly in my Letter to a Young Dissenting Minister,† with the books there recommended) I shall proceed to make the future profession of our other young friends, the qualifications requisite for it, the studies preparatory to it, and its honourable and useful exercise, the subject of a few remarks.

I am aware that, in venturing upon such a subject, I may incur a censure somewhat similar to that which was thrown upon the man who addressed to Hannibal a Treatise on War. But though the rules of an art may be recited by one who is himself no practical proficient in it, it is not my purpose to intrude beyond the threshold, or to presume to give directions as to a course of *proper* law-reading. This has already been done by Blackstone, in his Introductory Lectures; or perhaps more fully in "Simpson's Reflections on the natural and acquired Endowments requisite for the Study of the Law," and in a Treatise on the Study of the Law, including Letters of the Lords Mansfield, Ashburton, and Thurlow, both of which it may be worth your while to procure.‡ It is rather my object to point out the qualifications which should be possessed by the student of the law, the course he should pursue preparatory to its direct study, and the principles on which both the study and the practice of the law should be conducted.

The profession of the law, in all its branches, is of very great importance in the present complicated state of society; but it much depends on the character of the person himself who exercises it in any of them, whether it shall be a blessing or a curse. An unprincipled lawyer, from the highest office which he can hold in the state down to the lowest pettifogger, becomes, in proportion to the extent of his influence, one of the most mischievous pests of society: but an honourable man, who engages in any of its departments under a governing regard to justice, a sincere desire to promote the peace and happiness of his fellows, and a prevailing influential sense of the constant presence and inspection of God the Supreme Judge, is one of its greatest blessings. It is therefore of great importance that the student be well prepared to discharge its offices at once with ability and integrity.

With regard to the necessary intellectual pre-requisites to the successful study of the law, it is evident that a considerable degree of quickness of apprehension must be of great importance, without which, to a certain extent, memory and judgment can do but little, though they also are of equal necessity; but all the three must be under the direction, in order to any tolerable success, of severe and constant application. It is a frequent but foolish notion of the young and inexperienced, that brilliancy of imagination and depth of judgment are incompatible, and that the former may also dispense with diligence: but not one of the four can be dispensed with:

---

\* As reported in the July numbers of the Repository in each year.

† Repository for 1811, Vol. VI. pp. 471—479.

‡ There is also a very useful book, entitled "Advice on the Study of the Law, addressed to Attornies' Clerks," printed for Taylor and Hessey, 1810.



diligence must stimulate the judgment to arrange in lucid order the principles and facts presented to the memory by quick perception ; it will otherwise become a mere lumber-room, and nothing will be ready when it is wanted.

But the quickest apprehension requires judicious direction to the proper objects of its attention. And in this respect you, gentlemen, have enjoyed great advantages in this place, not only in consequence of the foundation which you have laid of sound classical learning, but also in the extensive course through which you have been led of ancient and modern history : the mathematical sciences, also, have given you the opportunity of exercising your minds in the patient investigation of truth ; while the study of mental and moral philosophy, and the evidences of natural and revealed religion, has introduced you, we would hope, to some valuable acquaintance with your powers, your duties, and your expectations. But you must not rest in these preparatory studies. You will find that the languages of Greece and Rome will still supply you with many excellent works, some of which it has been impossible to read at all, and others but cursorily, in this place, which yet will well reward your further attentive study of them, even in a professional point of view. The historians, orators and critics of both should now be studied with other more important references than formerly, as suggesting sound principles of government and legislation, and general political economy. The Roman law should be particularly studied, first as to its history, as it may be traced through Livy, Sallust, and Tacitus, and illustrated in the writings of Cicero and the epistles of the younger Pliny, and next as to its collected principles and rules in the Institutes of Justinian ; having first read the chapter on the Roman Law in Gibbon, and throughout availing yourselves of the helps furnished by Harris and Heineccius. You will find this study, though not strictly a proper part of the law of England, useful and even necessary, as forming, as it were, the basis of the civil and canon law, and particularly as being so much mixed with the law of wills and trusts.

The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, perused with a certain degree of caution, will lead by an easy process to a good general idea of the formation of the modern states of Europe. At the same time it may be proper to read the Treatises of Robertson (Vol. I. Ch. v.) and Stuart.

Whether, previous to the distinct study of the constitutions of the modern states, and particularly the constitution and laws of our own country, it may not be proper to read some one or more of the best treatises on the law of nature and nations, must depend on time and opportunity ; but it is certainly desirable at some time or other. Grotius is an admirable work on these subjects : Puffendorf is neither so elegant nor so entertaining ; but it is more exact and accurate, and full of excellent principles. Burlamaqui and Vattel are works of great authority at present.\*

In commencing the study of the laws of our own country, it is desirable to begin with some good constitutional history. It is well known that great

---

\* In some more advanced period, the civil polity and government of the Jews may profitably engage the attention of the law student ; taking for helps the Treatise by Lowman on the Civil Government of the Hebrews, and the *Mosaïsches Recht* of Michaelis. The modern codes of Catharine, Frederick, Napoleon, and that more lately drawn up for Louisiana, will also suggest many useful ideas on the general theory of both civil and criminal jurisprudence.

difference of opinion subsists respecting the origin of our legislative assemblies: the histories of Carte and Brady, with their interpreter and follower Hume, are on the regal; those of Lyttelton, Henry, Millar, and Hallam, on the popular side. Perhaps a young man who would wish to form an impartial opinion should study at least one writer on each side.

The time of the Law-Student in the early periods of his course, whether it be spent in a Solicitor's, or Conveyancer's, or Special Pleader's office, must of necessity be so much engaged in the regular routine-business of the office, and in the perusal of such works on the principles and practice of English law, and of that particular branch of it to which he means to devote himself, as the directors of such office may prescribe, (and concerning which I do not presume to say a word,) that a considerable portion of the course above recommended can only be pursued during the hours of leisure and recreation. But the study of the French, and, if possible, the German languages should be pursued; and, as soon as time can be allowed, the ancient dialects of them, the Anglo-Saxon and Norman-French, and the chronicles, &c., written in each, after which will follow the later chronicles, and the memoirs and papers of eminent men; to the store of which such valuable additions are almost annually given to the public.

I said I would not venture a word on books of proper English law: but there is one observation or caution respecting such books by the excellent Charles Butler,\* which I would strongly recommend to my young friends, that they "never suffer themselves to think or suspect for a moment that because they do not themselves at the time see the utility of what they, or the application of the part of it which they, are reading to any practical purpose, it is therefore useless." [May I not be permitted, by the way, to apply the same observation or caution to other branches of knowledge—the Mathematics, for example? There is no necessity, indeed, for every one to be a thorough-paced mathematician, but every one who would be thought a scholar, in the present advanced state of society, is expected to know something of the science of number and quantity; and it is impossible for any one to say how soon he may feel the want of it, and feel *himself* disgraced by his gross ignorance. Is it not, therefore, something like presumption for any young person to "make up his mind," and, because he has no particular taste for any study, determine to remain in total ignorance of it? But this, as I said, by the way.]

If time would have allowed, I should have wished to say something on the advantages and disadvantages of the method of recording the fruit of a student's reading by means of commonplace-books. The forms of these are various; the most convenient for the general scholar is probably that of Mr. Locke: others may perhaps be better suited to the student of some particular science. Blackstone, I think, recommends an interleaved copy of some standard work, as Comyns' Digest. But whatever may be the form, something of the kind may be very useful for the entering of the best definitions of law terms, and the reducing under specific heads the multifarious *dicta* of law books; and if they be had recourse to merely as helps to the memory, their use may be very great; but if as substitutes for it, they must be very pernicious.

The same may be said of short-hand, which I should earnestly recommend to every student as a very useful accomplishment; by the help of

---

\* It is directly applied to Coke upon Littleton: *Reminiscences*, Vol. I. p. 62.

which you, gentlemen, may, in the course of your practice in the courts, easily retain the arguments urged by the opposite parties, or with readiness put down your own thoughts on any particular subject. But if, after having them thus upon paper, you should get into the habit of flattering yourselves that you have the whole in your minds, you will find yourselves grievously mistaken when you come to have occasion to have recourse to them in actual practice.

I might also have wished to offer you some of my thoughts on the conduct proper to be pursued by a law student. You will of course perceive the necessity to success, in this as in other pursuits, of order and regularity in the distribution of your hours; of a diligent application of that portion of each day which is devoted to labour, and, in order to the maintenance of that health and vigour of body which are necessary to present enjoyment and ultimate success, of a due dedication of the other two portions to rest and recreation. As to recreations, I refer you to what I said on the last occasion of our meeting here, and as yours is likely to be even a still more sedentary occupation than that of the divine, I would recommend to you the choice of such recreations as are likely to afford both air and exercise. But if it be at any time necessary, in cases of a press of business, to abridge the hours, let it always, if possible, be those of recreation, rather than those of rest; a due proportion of which I deem to be absolutely necessary to the preservation of the bodily powers, and particularly the nervous system in a healthy state. Indeed, it is always with terror that I hear of any of my young friends sitting up all night, or even two nights, to make up for the loss of time which a regular and orderly scheme of distributing their time, steadily persisted in, would have prevented.

I hope I need not further observe, that recreations should always be kept within the strict limits of temperance; the transgression of which is always disgraceful, and its habitual transgression destructive of the powers both of body and mind. In the choice of companions you will be very careful to avoid all such intercourse as might lead you into temptations to vice of any kind; and you will find it a great use to select for your associates those with whom you may compare notes and sentiments, discuss difficult points, and argue supposed or real cases. Lord Mansfield states that he had received the greatest benefit from exercises of this kind, and that even when presiding on the King's Bench he had often had recourse to notes recording the discussions of his youth.

I have only further to offer you, gentlemen, my best wishes, and I venture to add the wishes of every one present, for your full success and satisfaction in the future exercise of your profession; that you may escape its many temptations, and answer all its beneficial purposes, and that you may always endeavour to prevent litigation wherever it may be possible; and when this cannot be, that you never descend to carry your point by misstatement or falsehood: and if you should ever be called to act as magistrates or senators, that in the one case you be careful to administer, and in the other to revise and correct, the laws of your country, under a high sense of justice, of the best interests of your country and mankind, and of your duty to Almighty God.

---



## REMARKS ON SOME PARTS OF HARTLEY'S RULE OF LIFE.

(Continued from p. 298.)

THE strong line of separation which is somewhat injudiciously drawn by many ethical writers between moral philosophy and revelation, is justly disregarded by Dr. Hartley, who introduces, without scruple, in support of his reasonings, considerations derived from the light of revealed truth. On these subjects his views are upon the whole just and enlightened; and yet there are some peculiar modes of interpretation to which he seems to have an inordinate attachment, and which appear to me to proceed altogether upon erroneous conceptions of the true sense of Scripture. In this class I should be disposed to rank his frequent allusions to the paradisaical state, and his representations of this world as a fallen, ruined world. He is also very apt to ascribe immediately and literally to Christians in every age, what was only intended to apply to the early disciples; and from this circumstance, among others, he has given his sanction to some conclusions which, if not altogether erroneous, require at least to be very considerably modified. A remarkable example of this may be found in the account he has given of the duty of obedience to the civil magistrate; which, in the positive, unlimited way in which he has stated it, seems to approach very nearly to the old, exploded doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance. The early Christians were literally a little flock, separated from the rest of mankind, not only by the smallness of their numbers, but by the peculiarity of their circumstances. The affairs of the world being avowedly conducted on principles utterly at variance with those of the gospel, it was, of course, impossible for them consistently to take a part in them. Still, however, St. Paul, though his expressions on this subject have been occasionally misunderstood, was always ready to assert his rights, and thought it by no means inconsistent with his character as a Christian and an apostle to avail himself of his political privileges as a Roman citizen. But in the present state of things, when the mass of the people are nominally Christians, and when the ruling powers are not avowedly hostile to the cause of Christ, it seems to be our duty to take advantage of every favourable opportunity for increasing the influence of religious principles over the conduct of public affairs as well as in the general state of society. And the prevalence of free institutions, which enable a man to exert himself with energy and effect in promoting these objects, is surely to be numbered among the talents which we are expected to apply and improve. Christians are the salt of the earth—the light of the world; but the light is not to be placed under a bushel, nor is the salt to be kept so distinct as to be prevented from exercising its purifying and corrective influence. From Hartley's language, however, on some occasions, it would almost seem as if he thought that every Christian, instead of using the world as not abusing it, was bound to abjure it altogether, and to take no part or interest whatever in its concerns.

Self-interest is reduced by Hartley to two heads, which have a reference to his peculiar classification of the principles of action; namely, *gross* self-interest, or that which is connected with the pursuit of the pleasures of sensation, imagination, and ambition; and *refined*, or that which arises from the indulgence of sympathy, theopathy, and the moral sense, pursued with an *explicit view* to the promotion of our own happiness. Both these, when made our primary pursuit, he endeavours to shew are inconsistent with our greatest improvement and happiness; the latter as much or even

more than the former. In this he will, perhaps, be thought by many to have gone too far,—and, in fact, some of his expressions are strong, and his doctrine is occasionally somewhat startling and paradoxical. There can be little doubt that the moral character, in the earlier stages of its development, is in a great measure influenced by motives derived from an immediate view to our own happiness as affected by our conduct, and that this will always continue to be so, more or less, as long as our characters are imperfect. We may go further, and maintain that an influential sense of the connexion between the practice of virtue and the greatest happiness of the agent, is an important and even indispensable instrument in the cultivation and improvement of the character, in the formation of virtuous habits, and ultimately in promoting and strengthening purely disinterested affections. It is, perhaps, scarcely wise absolutely to discountenance and reject any motives by which men, in a certain stage of their progress towards perfection, are incited to the performance of good actions; what is now done from a less worthy principle may afterwards be continued from a better. Nevertheless, Dr. Hartley will probably appear to be correct when he maintains that the acknowledged prevalence of interested motives in stimulating to the duties of benevolence and piety is a sufficient proof of the imperfect development of these principles in the mind; and it requires only a little attention to the nature of the process by which they are gradually produced to be aware that, though in the first instance derived from pleasures, desires, and pursuits altogether selfish, they have yet a *tendency* to approach nearer and nearer to a state in which they are perfectly disinterested; that is, in which they are pursued for their own sake, independently of all regard either express or implied to any other considerations. It will also appear, that the further this approximation has been carried, the more completely all selfish feelings are excluded from the motives by which man is incited to the practice of religion and virtue, the greater will be his progress towards the highest perfections of which his nature is capable, and the more completely will he fulfil all the purposes of his being.

The fact unquestionably is, that a just theory of the human mind, and of the gradual progress and succession of the different principles of action as they are generated by the influence of association, proves, in conformity with universal experience, that there are and must be generated in our constitution purely disinterested affections and feelings. We are born, it is certain, in a state wholly destitute of any such feelings; beings purely selfish, sensual, corporeal; knowing nothing beyond ourselves, nothing in ourselves, but mere bodily sensations. It is not, however, for a long time that the infant continues in this state either of intellectual or of moral insensibility. The various sensations which it experiences speedily give rise to ideas; the faculties of the understanding are roused into action; memory recalls the traces of past sensations; judgment compares them with those which are actually present; and they are connected and associated together in various combinations, so as quickly to call the mind into existence and exercise. Again, when the attention has been directed to the various impressions made from without, and the mind has learnt to reason concerning the causes of these impressions, and the manner in which its various wants are supplied, an idea presently arises of the connexion between these supplies, accommodations, and pleasures, and the attention and care of others. These ideas continually occurring in close connexion, shortly become united in the mind also in the way of association; since nearly all the pleasures which young children receive are conferred upon them by their



parents, attendants, or companions. Hence it appears that, according to the doctrine of association, a child, even in its earliest infancy, cannot be otherwise than pleased with the sight of its parents or friends; and that advancing years will strengthen these impressions, and confirm the dispositions and associations of which infancy has witnessed the commencement. Still further, a child will quickly perceive that his own pleasure is in a great degree connected with that of those who are about him. Almost from his birth he converses with his equals; and if he is one of a large family, he has many enjoyments and some sorrows in common with the rest. Here, then, are considerations in abundance to shew that, though originally a mere creature of matter and sense, the human being is placed in circumstances which necessarily give birth in a short time to sympathetic and benevolent affections; and thus it appears that the interest which we gradually learn to take in the happiness of those around us, is originally derived from the concern we necessarily feel for any thing that conduces to our own enjoyments. It may, however, in process of time, completely lose all trace of this origin, and become altogether disinterested, in the strictest sense of the term. Indeed, we know that it is the constant and universal tendency of association to produce transformations of this kind. It is needless to multiply instances to shew that where things have been frequently connected together in the mind by the relation of means and end, those feelings which were at first excited by the end or result alone, are afterwards so connected with and transferred upon the means which were originally interesting merely as being instrumental to the effect, that the acquisition of these means shall excite pleasure for their own sakes. A remarkable confirmation of this position may be derived from the fact, that those persons whose benevolence has been most active, who have been most frequently prompted to take an interest in the welfare and relief of others, and who, consequently, have been so much more frequently led to transfer these pleasurable feelings to their immediate objects and sources, have always these affections in a higher state of improvement and cultivation.

It appears, therefore, that we have not merely experience to prove it to be the fact, but just and enlarged views of human nature to point it out as the necessary result of the circumstances in which the human being is placed, that affections purely disinterested, lively feelings of pleasure on contemplating the happiness, of pain on beholding the sufferings, of others, altogether distinct from any idea of the connexion of such circumstances with our own condition or happiness, do gradually take root and grow to perfection in the human mind. But theory, I will venture to say even experience, authorizes us to go further than this; and to conclude that these benevolent affections have a continual tendency to increase; and that we are so constituted as to render this a necessary consequence of the various connexions which subsist between us and our fellow-creatures, and of that moral discipline which the circumstances of our present lot appear destined to exercise over our minds. We shall be naturally led to this conclusion, if we consider how much greater an object is the general welfare than that towards which the selfish affections are immediately directed; in how much greater a variety of ways the pleasures and pains connected with it are likely to be excited; the comparative meanness and insignificance of selfish objects and pursuits; and the associations of generosity, dignity, and excellence, which are invariably annexed to the more enlarged and extensive affections. Thus we see that these must increase, while the others must necessarily decrease, in proportion as we come to see the littleness and com-



parative insignificance of our own concerns and interests when contrasted with the grand and magnificent idea of universal happiness.

What, then, must be the consequence, if these views of the progressive nature of the benevolent feelings in the human mind be correct? What inference must we be led to deduce from them with regard to the future and final improvement of man? Certainly, that this progress shall be indefinitely continued through endless ages; that as our views extend, as our knowledge becomes more complete and accurate, as our minds become more enlightened, our faculties more comprehensive, as we are gradually enabled to pass with more facility from causes to their remote consequences, and as our eyes are thus opened to discern more clearly the connexions and bearings of the several parts in this vast and wonderful plan of Providence, we shall proceed and act continually upon more and more enlarged conceptions of the necessary connexion of our own welfare with the highest happiness and perfection of the whole; and that we shall go on without end in this course of advancement, tending constantly to that ultimate state which seems marked out even here as the *limit*, the point towards which all our steps are to be directed, where all merely selfish views shall be finally and for ever banished, where a regard to the interests of the whole universe, of which we shall probably be enabled to acquire a more and more thorough comprehension, shall be our leading principle of action, our great and primary pursuit.

Such is the dictate of philosophy, at least not discountenanced by the light of revelation. Such is the ultimate point towards which we are continually tending; and though it is possible that we may not be able in any finite period absolutely to reach it, yet it seems not improbable that our progress towards it may at length be carried to an extent far exceeding the highest conceptions which our minds in their present state can frame. That self-annihilation, as our author styles it, which consists in a complete absorption of all merely selfish feelings and desires in the increasing interest which is felt in more noble and worthy objects of contemplation, is therefore the true moral perfection of a rational nature. Even in this life, the most eminently virtuous characters display invariably in the greatest degree the influence of a general philanthropy; it is they who are, on all occasions, most ready to sacrifice their own comforts and enjoyments for the benefit of their fellow-creatures; it is they who have made the greatest progress in enlarging and extending their views, in cultivating those dispositions which lead them to sympathize in and to promote the well-being of others, who obtain for themselves the truest and purest pleasures, whose happiness is least dependent on accidental circumstances. Nevertheless, it seems necessary, in order to the full attainment of this happiness, that it should cease to be proposed as a motive to exertion; nay, the more completely it is laid out of view, the more entirely our conduct can be directed immediately and solely by the dictates of benevolence and piety, the more effectually will that enjoyment which is the object of rational self-interest be secured.

On the views which have now been stated of the origin and gradual progress towards perfection of the social and benevolent affections, Dr. Hartley's account of the influence which these affections ought to have in forming the rule of life, is chiefly founded. His proposition is, that "the pleasures of sympathy improve those of sensation, imagination, ambition, and self-interest, and unite with those of theopathy and the moral sense; they are self-consistent and admit of an unlimited extent; they may therefore be our primary pursuit." His observations in support of this position are, on the

whole, correct and highly important. There is only one point which may perhaps require to be in some degree modified or explained. "When engaged in promoting the happiness of others, we may," says he, "in general expect success. When our benevolence is pure, and directed by a regard to the dictates of conscience and the will of God, it will seldom fail of gaining its purpose. And yet disappointments must sometimes happen to the purest benevolence; else our love of God and resignation to his will, which is the highest principle of all, could not be brought to perfection. But then this will happen so rarely as to make no alteration in our reasonings with respect to the general state of things; which kind of reasoning and certainty is all that we are qualified for in our present condition."

What is here stated will probably be true, provided that the practical influence of the principle of benevolence is under the constant guidance of sound and rational views, not only of the extent of our own powers and opportunities, but also of the effects, remote as well as immediate, upon society at large of the conduct to which we may thus be incited. All this is of course necessarily included in the supposition, because nothing can be more manifest than that, other things being the same, it may be expected that a man's success in any undertaking will be proportioned to the adaptation of his means for accomplishing it; and in the present case these means in a great measure depend upon and consist in the possession of an enlightened understanding capable of taking a clear and comprehensive view of its own situation, and the absolute and relative practicability of the different undertakings which offer themselves to its notice. And probably the first labour of a really benevolent and, at the same time, judicious person, will be to acquire that kind of knowledge, particularly of the circumstances on which the true happiness of the lower classes of society mainly depend, and the manner in which, in the very complicated social state which prevails in modern civilized nations, the multiplied relations which exist among different classes tend to promote or impede the true interests of all. Without some such knowledge as this, there is reason to be apprehensive that, with the most benevolent intentions, he may often do more harm than good; and it is but too manifest that many persons, with respect to whose pure and disinterested wishes to promote the good of their fellow-creatures there can scarcely be a question, have nevertheless been the instruments of great and extensive mischief. Some of the principles which it is desirable to bear in mind in the practical direction of the principle of benevolence are well stated by Dr. Chalmers, in his "*Essays on the Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns*," a work of extraordinary interest and value, which contains much sound theory on this subject, illustrated by its successful application to practice on no inconsiderable scale. The observations of Hartley are, perhaps, liable to some misapprehension; and indeed it is not impossible that he himself may not have been sufficiently aware of the extent to which a want of the knowledge necessary for successfully concerting and executing measures intended to promote on a large scale the temporal interests of masses of mankind, has impeded the attainment of their professed object, or even ultimately rendered them the instruments, not of good, but of great and serious evils. These subjects are now in many respects much better understood, and it is scarcely possible that any person of good sense, and accustomed to reflection, should fail to perceive the necessity of this caution, or the great complexity of operation of many institutions originally suggested, no doubt, by the most benevolent and public-spirited motives.

Still, however, when subjected to the limitation which we have now en-



deavoured to point out, the remark of Hartley is true and important, and is very judiciously introduced by him as a forcible argument in support of his position. It may be added as a sort of corollary to this argument, that as in those more limited relations of a social nature to which the greater part of most men's attention is naturally directed, and in which their exertions will commonly be most really and extensively useful, they will endeavour as much as possible to cultivate an enlargement and comprehension of mind which shall enable them to follow out as far as it is permitted, and to take a lively interest in, the measures of Divine Providence for the greatest good of the whole. By endeavouring in this manner to take a general view of the whole, (at least of all that falls in any degree under our observation,) we should obtain the most effectual support and consolation amidst the perplexities occasioned by partial and temporary distresses, which we shall sometimes see, and may always devoutly believe to be the necessary instruments of much greater and universal good. We might thus also be enabled to guard against the evils and dangers which might otherwise arise to our own moral welfare, from the undue prevalence of those more confined affections of the social kind towards our families, our friends, our country, which are too apt, when not thus checked, to lead men astray and prompt them to seek the attainment of their objects by means very far indeed removed from the path of rectitude. Such principles of action, when thus perverted from the semblance and false show of benevolence which they assume, are peculiarly dangerous, even more so than undisguised selfishness; since men are less upon their guard against them, and are often impelled by them to commit, without compunction or remorse, actions which they would have shrunk from, if proposed merely for the promotion of their own personal interests.

It ought not, however, to be concealed, that there is a caution necessary on the opposite hand, when we proceed practically to apply the preceding remarks in the regulation of our benevolent affections. We ought, above all things, to be on our guard against an habitually cold and unfeeling disposition, regardless of the welfare of those about us. Those who are called upon by their station and office to take a leading part in affairs extensively affecting the welfare of great numbers, in the direction of measures on the whole highly conducive to the public good, find it necessary sometimes to sacrifice the minor interests of individuals. In such cases, reason teaches us that the smaller interest must give way to the greater, but the sacrifice is not on that account the less an evil. The limited nature, however, of the human faculties obliges men so circumstanced to confine their attention to general results, and if these appear to be favourable, to shut their eyes against the incidental mischief. But in shutting their eyes, they are apt also to shut their hearts, and thus is too often produced a degree of callousness to individual suffering, which is one of the many moral evils incident to high and prominent station. And even with respect to persons in private life, it is possible that the habit of referring every thing to general principles, looking away from and beyond the particular consequence in our regard for the general rule, may occasionally be carried to a dangerous extent by beings whose views and knowledge are necessarily, after all, exceedingly limited and imperfect. And when this is the case, there is reason to fear that our own characters may suffer more harm from the neglect with which we are tempted to treat particular evils, than they derive advantage from the cultivation of that comprehension of mind which enables us to look beyond these evils to the ultimate and possibly more important good.

The proper effect of a familiarity with sound general principles should



be to direct and enliven, not to extirpate the natural feelings of the heart. If, then, in balancing consequences, particular and general, immediate and remote, certain and only probable, there be any room to doubt on which side the determination ought to be given, perhaps it will generally be the part of wisdom to leave the impulses of benevolent feeling to settle the question, rather than run the risk of narrowing the naturally expansive affection. In such cases, let us be contented with doing a little immediate good in our own peculiar sphere, and if some inconvenience should arise, leave it to Providence. There is a danger, as Hartley has ingeniously but correctly observed, lest in attempting to love all equally, we come not to love others more, but our brethren less than we did before.

The preceding remarks may serve to expose the fallacy of those misapplications of the principle of general philanthropy, which have led some writers to decry the influence of the more limited social affections. Every man, we have been told, is bound to consider himself as a citizen of the world. All those intimate connexions and relationships which are commonly considered as implying a peculiar obligation, are to be disregarded. To pay any attention to the tender names of parent or child, husband or wife, friend or benefactor, to consult their happiness in the first place, to promote their interests in preference to the remotest and most unconnected individual of the human race, is the result of an absurd and unphilosophical prejudice. Such notions as these are not less inconsistent with the present constitution of society, than with the confessedly imperfect powers and attainments of the human mind. As long as man is limited in his powers, as long as his knowledge is confined and imperfect, as long as there are persons whose interests, from his more intimate connexion with them, he can promote more effectually than those of his remoter fellow-creatures, so long is he bound to pay attention to those relations in which he stands to particular individuals. A Being whose power and knowledge are infinite will certainly look upon all his creatures with an equal eye; no distances or intervals either of time or space can bring them nearer or carry them further off from his notice and protection. His government, therefore, is doubtless regulated with a view to consult equally the happiness of all, and has a reference solely to the *absolute* personal qualities of different individuals. But a finite, created being must always be more intimately connected with one part of the universe than another; in his mind the past and future can never be so thoroughly blended as to become, practically speaking, present; he must therefore be unequally affected by the condition of different parts of the creation, and his powers must always be adapted to the promotion of some objects in preference to others.

It is not unreasonable, however, to presume that, in the course of an indefinite period of advancement, as the range of our ideas, our opportunities of information, and our means of action will be more and more extended, our habitual principle of action may be permitted to assume more of an equal and impartial character. It should also be recollected in the mean time, that the limited sphere in which Providence has cast our peculiar lot, though it may oblige us to act with an habitual reference to more confined views, is by no means inconsistent with the encouragement of the most enlarged and universal benevolence.

W. T.

OPINIONS OF CONTINENTAL PROTESTANTS ON THE CATHOLIC  
QUESTION.

[In the Monthly Repository for March last (p. 150) a letter was inserted from Mr. Bowring on the present state of religion in Holland and Germany, which has excited considerable attention and some discussion in those countries. It has been republished at Hamburg, in No. III. of a work entitled "The Gleaner, or Specimens of the Periodical Literature of Great Britain and the United States" (edited by C. F. Wurm, Phil. D. M. A.); with some animadversions on Mr. B.'s reference to the views of Professor Paulus and other Continental Protestants on the question of Catholic Emancipation. We shall quote the two passages of the letter to which those animadversions relate :

"The only strong sectarian feeling among Dutch Protestants is that which hangs about *their* 'Catholic question,' a question not quite so divested of difficulties as *our* Catholic question, since *their* Catholicism wields instruments of prodigious influence, and has unfortunately shewed itself on all occasions the hearty ally of civil despotism." And afterwards, speaking of Professor Paulus : "But he, like most of the Continental Protestants, and particularly those who look up to Göthe and to Voss, have the same prejudices against the Catholics which I have spoken of as existing in Holland, and would deem the success of the 'Emancipation question' an European calamity. In looking at a few numbers of his *Sophronizon*, you would find evidence enough of the state of his mind on this important matter."

If injustice be done to Professor Paulus by these passages, and perhaps their juxta-position exhibits an ascription to him of "strong sectarian feeling" which the writer did not fully contemplate, it will, we trust, be remedied by the remarks of the Editor of the Gleaner, who, it will be seen, coincides in opinion with Mr. Bowring on the Catholic question, as we are sure Mr. Bowring does with him on the pure and elevated character of the illustrious Paulus. We insert his "Note" entire, and cannot but express our pleasure at the manner in which he has spoken of our countryman and friend, our admiration of his command over our language, and our hearty coincidence in the reasonings with which he concludes. ED.]

*Note by the Editor of the Gleaner on Mr. Bowring's Letter.*

Interesting as the above letter will doubtless be to many of our readers, we should not have thought it right to insert it, were there not evidence on the face of it that it has been intended for publication. But having inserted it, we cannot pass it over, as the Editor of the Monthly Repository has done, "without note or comment."

The writer of that letter has obviously mistaken the spirit in which one class of enlightened Protestant Divines have opposed the *principle* of Catholic Emancipation. At this we are not surprised. We can easily account for the difficulty which he finds, of reconciling their liberality on all other points with their illiberality on this. It is not only that national peculiarities will insensibly steal upon the judgment; there is also the diversity of pursuits, of individual predilections and associations, and the tone of mind corresponding to the surrounding literary atmosphere—which will go a

great way towards engendering an almost radical diversity of views, and which will not allow the most gifted and the most candid to agree on those points which they have equally at heart.

Non Dî, non homines, non concessere columnæ.

It would be little short of a miracle, indeed, if Professor Paulus and Mr. Bowring could have come to an exact understanding on the question at issue. We shall be told, that there is not one in ten thousand Englishmen who stands so clear of national prejudice as John Bowring. We know it; and we rejoice in it for his sake and the few who are like him; though we are sorry for the many. We also know that he has broached the principle of general utility, not that grovelling principle which belongs to a mind "centred all in self," but that most comprehensive and unalterable rule of action which, under all circumstances, points solely to the real interests of mankind. In conformity with this, he would level those barriers which inordinate ambition and uncontrolled power have raised among men; he would sweep away the vile work of oppression and priestcraft; he would equalize the conditions, under which labour shall be rewarded and talent appreciated; he would throw open the avenues which lead to honourable independence, that every one might take his station in society according to the measure of his abilities and intelligence, and worship his God after his own heart. Having laid down the principle of utility as the basis of the system of the Commonwealth, he would have the vessel of the state "navigated through the broad ocean of liberty, not through the tortuous canal of political expediency."

In the political tenets of Mr. Bowring we think we may recognize the same characteristics by which he stands distinguished as a poet; a facility of the imagination to realize pleasing conceptions, and, what we value much higher, a truth and affluence and *universality* of feeling. To these qualities he owes that superiority as a translator of national poetry, by which he ranks next to our own admirable Herder. The graceful touch of Talvj, and the naïveté of Chamisso; the dashing rhythm of Bürger, and the heart-stirring enthusiasm of Wilhelm Müller, have conspired to render John Bowring the genuine interpreter of those fleeting sounds, which in different countries of Europe one century has transmitted to the other, varied according to the tone of national feeling and character. Add to which, that sincere and heart-felt devotion which his religious poetry breathes in every line. With a mind thus nobly gifted, with that affluent vein of sympathy, need we say, that we acquit him at once of the charge of Sectarianism, though he may choose to call himself a Utilitarian in politics, and a Unitarian in theology?—But in his character as a reasoner, we are not surprised if he is tempted in the discussion of important questions to disregard certain scruples *in limine* as jejune and cold, and to slight a certain caution as illiberal and ungenerous. We question whether the illustrious patriarch of his political sect, if he had the same opportunities of appreciating the views of German reasoners, would have treated them with the same *non-chalance*. If we are not much mistaken, Jeremy Bentham would be prepared to pause and examine with Professor Paulus, much rather than to soar with Mr. Bowring.

We repeat, that Mr. Bowring must have completely mistaken Professor Paulus on the grounds of his opposition to the principle of the Catholic claims. Has Mr. Bowring been able to identify himself with that strictness of logical argument, with that rigid adherence to fundamental prin-



ciples, with that "undivided allegiance" to right reason? We would not ask him to embrace it as his own creed, but to revere it as the mental property of another. But the fact is, that the discrepancy is radical, and, we fear, is difficult to be remedied. If Mr. Bowring would eagerly accelerate universal equality, Professor Paulus would be no less anxious to guard against possible impediments to that "consummation devoutly to be wished." The German Divine may be more zealous in the hatred of mental despotism; the English Liberal more ardent in the love of intellectual liberty. The one may be more indefatigable in the exposure of fraud or prejudice; the other more fervid in his devotion to what he considers to be divine truth. The uncompromising liberality of the latter may outrun the dignified caution of the former; but that is no reason why both should not be willing to acknowledge that they are tending to the same end.

And this brings us back to the only objection which we have against Mr. Bowring's remarks. He ought to have been on his guard against giving an erroneous impression to his readers. He was writing for an English public; he ought to have been aware of the dearth of correct information about foreign literature, and of the proneness of his countrymen to measure things abroad by the familiar scale of things at home. We would put it to Mr. Bowring, whether he would not be grieved to think that his want of explicitness may lead others to misjudge the character of Professor Paulus' views. We would put it to his candour, whether he thinks that his remarks will induce others to do justice to the motives of that eminent Divine. Mr. Bowring may be fully inclined to do justice to them; but, will his readers? Would he not have done better to draw at once the broad line of demarcation between the champions of Protestantism and the clamorous mouth-pieces of Church-of-Englandism? It is one thing to be jealous, even to the extreme, of the claims of reason, and another, to be tenacious of the privileges and the good things of Mother Church. Mr. Bowring himself would consider it an insult to name the hardened arrogance of a Phillpotts, or the random declamations of a Southey, in the same breath with the labours of Professor Paulus. Then why not prevent those who may be less informed from falling into a similar mistake? Why not state in a few words, but distinctly, that the Protestantism which Professor Paulus advocates, is diametrically opposed, not only to Roman Catholic Supremacy, but to any sort of human authority that might interfere with mental independence; that it does not imply any more deference to articles of faith, devised three hundred years ago, than to Nicene decrees or Popish Bulls; that it would wrench power from a Protestant Hierarchy as well as from a Catholic one; that it would commend certain speculative opinions, and reject others, but enjoin only the one principle of free inquiry.

Having said thus much, we shall not decline stating the opinion which we have formed for ourselves on the point at issue. We are opposed to the principle of any religious test whatever. We would discard all political distinctions on account of religious belief. In this instance also, as indeed on most others, we think that those who have come up to the truth more closely than others, are the Americans—"fortunati nimium, sua si bona norint." We are convinced, that any distinctions of that kind must be injurious to the interests of the state, and to those of religion. What can be worse for the eliciting of truth, than to give so strong a bias to the motives of those in search of it—to make it gain to arrive at one result, and loss to adopt another? Such a system must engender hypocrisy, and perpetuate error. It induces teachers to capitulate with their conscience, and

bearers with their intellect. We speak of those for whom the law is made, not of those who do not want it—of the many, not of the few. And on the many—on the great majority—we maintain, that all interference of the state in matters of opinion does produce such results. Hence the marked unwillingness to sustain the unequal combat between reason and authority. Hence the temptation, to insinuate covertly, what must not be asserted openly; to wield the weapons of sophistry and cavil, and all the armour of cowardice, “willing to wound, but yet afraid to strike.” For an exemplification of the fact, we need not travel far. Look at the system that prevails throughout Protestant Germany. Does she not bind her ministers down to doctrines which have been dismissed by the majority of her Divines? This is a theme of melancholy importance, and one into which we cannot enter more fully within our present limits. But the only remedy we can see for such a state of things would be for the law to allow of no distinctions connected with speculative opinions. It may be said, that there are opinions which would lead to results injurious to the State. Whether such a state be the most perfect or not, we will not now stop to inquire. But we know this, that such effects would be amenable to the law. Or, if the law does not take cognizance of them, they will not escape the denunciation of a Free Press—they will gradually vanish before the progress of national intelligence. We cannot concur in those apprehensions which are frequently expressed. It has frequently been our lot to listen to such arguments with respect and attention, but without assent or conviction. We may instance our view of the case in the “Catholic Question.” The probable consequences of emancipation must depend on the motives by which emancipated Catholics would be likely to be guided. Are these motives honourable and candid? They can hardly fail of leading to enlightened sentiments, and to the abandoning of prejudice. Are they of a more vulgar cast, and interested? Then we would plead, that St. James’s is nearer at hand than the Vatican; that an Irish Catholic will provide better for his interest by holding his allegiance to George IV. than to Leo X. But the generality of men will act from *mixed* motives. Granted; and it will, no doubt, come to pass that error will rear her head and run unchecked for a while; that some mischief will be done by day-light, which would else have been perpetrated by stealth. Fanaticism is playing its freaks even in America; and, by the bye, our very next paper will state a “pretty particular” case of it. But is it error alone that has power over the minds of men? Is truth nothing? Has not error been supported principally by an appeal to the selfish interests, to the sordid passions of men? Has not truth triumphed over all those obstacles? Let those obstacles be removed—take away the props of error—the patronage of falsehood—the barriers to improvement; do not set a man’s interest at variance with his conscience; and we are willing to abide by the issue.

If these lines should ever meet his eye, we are sure that John Bowring will take them in good part. And we may hope the same from the eminent Divine, from whose school we have freely intimated our dissent—though we trust that we are not strangers to the admiration commanded by his varied learning and unparalleled acumen, or to the veneration due to a long and active life devoted to TRUTH, the WHOLE Truth, and nothing BUT the Truth.

## REVIEW.

---

**ART. I.**—*The Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe, D. D., illustrated principally from his unpublished MSS. ; with a Preliminary View of the Papal System, and of the State of the Protestant Doctrine in Europe to the Commencement of the Fourteenth Century.* By Robert Vaughan. London. Holdsworth.

WE entirely agree with the author of the work now before us, that in the annals of this country there are hundreds of men whose names should not be repeated with that of Wycliffe, to the illustration of whose history a much larger portion of industry and talent has been applied. This may be ascribed partly to the remoteness and comparative obscurity of the period in which he lived, and partly to the propensity so generally observable among men to undervalue those talents and exertions which the counsels of Providence have not seen fit to reward with apparent and immediate success. Whatever may have been the impression produced by the labours of Wycliffe upon his personal friends and disciples, to the cursory and superficial observer it appears to have soon passed away. It was a light shining in a dark place which was speedily overwhelmed by the damps and vapours around it; a premature and fruitless attempt to struggle against corruption and oppression; to bring back a purer light of divine truth which the times were as yet unable to bear. For a while, the obscene birds of night, which had so long held undisputed sway, were disturbed and affrighted by the unwonted apparition; but they presently rallied their forces, and not only were they enabled to chase away the rising spirit, but the land was again overwhelmed apparently with more hopeless and impenetrable darkness. In reading the history of the church, after toiling through many a dreary century of ignorance, superstition, and spiritual thralldom, or tracing what might at first view appear the abortive exertions of this eminent forerunner of the Reformation, followed for awhile by an access of still heavier and deeper gloom, we are tempted to close the page in disappointment—We had trusted it had been he who should have redeemed his brethren!

The feeling is an erroneous one, for there can be no doubt that the impression thus produced did not altogether die away; the seed was committed to an ungrateful soil and at an apparently ungenial season; but much of it was preserved to sprout and bear fruit in happier times, and to exert a material influence on the changes which were afterwards more successfully accomplished. Still, however, there can be no doubt that the feeling exists, and has mainly prevented this illustrious reformer from receiving at the hands of posterity that meed of applause to which his talents, his virtues, and his labours, would otherwise have entitled him.

The outline of this eminent man's story belongs to the history of the times, and may be found with more or less correctness in various places. Among others, it has been pleasingly traced by Mr. Gilpin in his "*Lives of the Reformers.*" This, however, is a mere sketch, the perusal of which can do little more than excite the reader's curiosity for more full and copious information, a curiosity which Mr. Vaughan has laboured with a laudable and, on the whole, a successful industry to gratify.

The original materials, if they may be so called, for this purpose, pre-



viously in possession of the public, appear to have been but scanty. The only person who can be said to have attempted any thing of this kind is Mr. Lewis, who was also the original editor of Wycliffe's translation of the New Testament. This writer certainly cannot be said to have superseded the necessity of further and more extensive researches in the same field, though we think Mr. V. has somewhat undervalued the labours of his predecessor. His performance, indeed, may rather be called materials for a Life than the finished work itself; the style, too, is antiquated and uncouth; but the book does not seem to us so utterly "unreadable" as it is represented by Mr. Vaughan. The present writer, however, has certainly produced a work in every respect much superior and more valuable. He has evidently used a diligence and research worthy of his subject, and has not only disposed in a more acceptable form what had been communicated by preceding writers, but has made very considerable additions to the information hitherto accessible to the public. For this purpose he has examined, apparently with great care and labour, the numerous writings of Wycliffe yet remaining in MS. in our different public libraries. Of many of the most important of these he has presented us with a detailed analysis, and has inserted a variety of interesting and valuable extracts, which may assist the reader in forming a fair estimate of the talents, learning, and opinions, of our reformer, and of the real efficacy of his labours. These are among the most valuable, and to the public in general the most truly original, parts of his work, and in making them more generally accessible, we think he has performed a very important and acceptable service.

In one respect only we feel disposed to express our regret at the manner in which he has thought it best to perform this service. He seems to us to have carried his regard for the fastidious taste of the modern reader to an extreme. While we admit that it was in general desirable, and indeed necessary, in some degree, to modernize the orthography, and even the language, by the occasional rejection of obsolete terms, without which he is perhaps right in thinking that the passages inserted would have failed to receive the attention they deserve, yet we doubt whether it was necessary for this purpose to make his author speak so entirely the language of the present day, and should have been better pleased if he had been allowed occasionally to express himself in his original, homely, but unsophisticated, forcible, and impressive style. It is more easy to judge of the character and manners, if not of the sentiments, from the *ipsissima verba*, and the reader feels himself more at home with the personages of the narrative when they are introduced to him as far as possible in their original, national, or peculiar costume. Besides, the language itself is perhaps an inferior, but still, to an English reader, an interesting, object of curiosity. Though Wycliffe was contemporary with Chaucer, his vernacular idiom approaches one step nearer than that of the poet to the English of the present day, and from the avidity with which, even under unfavourable circumstances, his writings were sought after, and the extent to which they were circulated and read, there can be no doubt that they exerted a powerful influence in forming and advancing towards maturity the as yet rude and imperfect dialect of the times. On these grounds, therefore, we think the critical inquirer into the history of his own language would have been gratified by a few opportunities of exploring this "genuine well of English undefiled," by studying the peculiarities of Wycliffe's composition in his native tongue, as presented in their original dress. And we have often wondered that this natural curiosity alone, independently of the interest attached to them from their intrinsic

value and their connexion with the history of religious reformation, has not led to the publication of at least a copious selection from our reformer's vernacular compositions.

As specimens of the vigour of thought and reasoning which distinguish both his practical and argumentative pieces, we subjoin the following passages, modernized, it is true, by Mr. V.; but the attentive reader, we think, will be satisfied by internal evidence that he is to be depended on when he assures us that the substance of his author's language has been carefully preserved, and with it every the minutest shade of his meaning.

"It is in the following language that he contends for that liberty of prophesying, which has diffused so powerful an influence over the institutions of this country, and over the character of its people. 'Worldly prelates command that no man should preach the gospel, but according to their will and limitation, and forbid men to hear the gospel on pain of the great curse. But Satan, in his own person, durst never do so much despite to Christ and to his gospel, for he alleged holy writ in tempting Christ, and thereby would have pursued his intent. And since it is the counsel and commandment of Christ to priests generally, that they preach the gospel, and as this they must not do without leave of prelates, who, it may be, are fiends of hell; it follows that priests may not do the commands of Christ, without the leave of fiends. Ah! Lord Jesus, are these sinful fools, and in some cases fiends of hell, more witty and mighty than thou, that true men may not do thy will, without authority from them? Ah! Lord God Almighty, all wise, and all full of charity, how long wilt thou suffer these antichrists to despise thee, and thy holy gospel, and to prevent the health of the souls of Christian men? Lord of endless righteousness, this thou sufferest, because of sin generally reigning among the people; but of thine endless mercy and goodness, help thy poor wretched priests and servants, that they possess the love and reverence of thy gospel, and be not hindered to do thy worship and will by the false feignings of antichrist. Almighty Lord God, most merciful, and in wisdom boundless, since thou sufferedst Peter and all apostles to have so great fear and cowardice at the time of thy passion, that they flew all away for dread of death, and for a poor woman's voice; and since afterwards by the comfort of the Holy Ghost, thou madest them so strong that they were afraid of no man, nor of pain, nor death; help now, by gifts of the same Spirit, thy poor servants, who all their life have been cowards, and make them strong, and bold in thy cause, to maintain the gospel against antichrist, and the tyrants of this world.'"—II. pp. 279, 280.

"It is in the following language that he describes the self-denial and devotedness which the gospel requires of its sincere disciples: 'Christ not compelling, but freely counselling every man to seek a perfect life, saith, 'Let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me.' Let us then deny ourselves in whatever we have made ourselves by sin, and such as we are made by grace, let us continue. If a proud man be converted to Christ and is made humble, he hath denied himself. If a covetous man ceaseth to covet, and giveth of his own to relieve the needy, he hath denied himself. If an impure man changeth his life and becometh chaste, he hath denied himself, as St. Gregory saith. He who withstandeth and forsaketh the unreasonable will of the flesh, denieth himself. The cross of Christ is taken when we shrink not from contempt for the love of the truth; when man is crucified unto the world, and the world is crucified unto him, and he setteth its joy at nought. It is not enough to bear the cross of a painful life, except we follow Christ in his virtues, in meekness, love, and heavenly desire. He taketh the cross who is ready to meet all peril for God; if need be to die rather than to forsake Christ. And whoso taketh not thus the cross, and followeth not Christ thus, is not worthy to be his disciple.—Lord Jesus, turn us to thee, and we shall be turned! Heal thou us, and then we shall be verily



holv; for without grace and help from thee, may no man be truly turned or healed. For they are but scorers, who to-day turn to God, and to-morrow turn away; who to-day do their penance, and to-morrow turn again to their former evils. What is turning to God? Nothing but turning from the world, from sin, and from the fiend. What is turning from God, but turning to the changing things of this world, to delight in the creatures, the lusts of the flesh, and the works of the fiend. To be turned from the world, is to set at nought its joys, and to suffer meekly all bitterness, slanders, and deceits, for the love of Christ. To leave all occupations unlawful and unprofitable to the soul, so that man's will and thought become dead to the things which the world loveth or worshipeth.'—Pp. 360—362.

What might not have been expected, if the press had been at hand to lend its multiplying agency to a pen like this!

The work commences with an extensive introductory view of the previous state of the Christian church down to the time of the English reformer. This is distributed into three chapters; the first relating to the rise and character of the Papal power; the second to the state of what is called, by a sort of *prolepsis*, the Protestant doctrine in Europe to the commencement of the fourteenth century; and the third treats of the ecclesiastical establishment and the state of society in England previous to the age of Wycliffe. This introduction, both in the extent and variety of its details, may perhaps appear to some out of proportion to the main body of the work; it is, however, interesting and valuable, and, in fact, it contains little that may not be considered as throwing light on the state of things at the appearance of Wycliffe on the stage, and a knowledge or recollection of which may consequently assist the reader in duly appreciating the character and merits of the reformer, the difficulties, the dangers, and the partial success which attended his labours. We have here, of course, little or no original matter; but a meritorious diligence and judgment is displayed by the author in availing himself of the facts already before the public, of which we have an abridged and, on the whole, a distinct and satisfactory outline. The facts collected in the second chapter, on the state of the doctrines afterwards professed by the Protestants, lead to the remarkable conclusion, that notwithstanding the overwhelming spread of superstition and ignorance and spiritual bondage, there was never entirely wanting a little and obscure remnant which held out against the tide and adhered to the primitive faith once delivered to the saints, or at least raised its testimony against the priestly domination which threatened to crush every vestige of genuine Christianity, and all rights, civil as well as religious, in one general ruin. The resistance which was occasionally raised to this unrighteous empire over the consciences of men, and the shocking excesses which were committed in putting down that resistance, are recorded in some of the most sad and sanguine pages of the history of mankind. Nevertheless, the Paulicians, the followers of Paulinus and of Claude of Turin; the martyrs of Cologne; the Albigenses, whose melancholy history and final extirpation is a foul and indelible blot on the annals of the Romish church; the Vaudois, who seem in the fortresses of their Alpine valleys to have maintained a traditionary primitive purity which might almost vindicate its claims to apostolic descent; these in succession bring us down at length to the dawn of brighter and more auspicious days. In England, however, few traces are discoverable of a disposition to question the authority of the church in matters of doctrine, or to search for religious truth in a higher and purer source. The resistance which was here manifested, from time to time, by Grossteste and others,



appears to have been of a political rather than a religious or theological character; relating to the despotic pretensions and mercenary spoliations of the court of Rome, rather than to its doctrines or the authority of the church in matters of faith, which none of them appear to have questioned before the time of Wycliffe.

"It appears then," our author observes, "as the result of the facts adduced in these introductory chapters, that the papal system exhibits so great a corruption of the Christian worship, polity, and doctrine, as to render the traces of their original purity, discoverable in Europe during the middle ages, but so many exceptions to the faith and customs which every where prevailed. It is conceded that the hostilities directed against that vast usurpation may not always have originated in Christian motives, nor have been always sustained by Christian feeling; but that such was their general character is certain. It has also appeared that the means employed to crush such movements were in general truly worthy of the causes which had led to so gross a perversion of the highest good conferred on man; being chiefly remarkable for their contempt of honour, justice, and humanity! In England, the most serious costs and the worst disgrace imposed on the nations by the papacy, were too long submitted to; and if the horrors of the Albigensian massacres were not reacted in her cities, it was perhaps, chiefly, because, amid her various opposition to that lawless power, there was little, till toward the close of the fourteenth century, that could be branded with the name of heresy. We have also seen that through nearly two centuries, prior to the appearance of Wycliffe, the crime of heresy had become so connected with the loathing or the terror of the popular mind, that amidst commercial enterprise, the partial revival of letters, and some advances in the science of government, the signs of a religious reformation which had illumined a portion of the continent, to the dawn of the twelfth century, were no more perceived. The power of the church had been wielded to intimidate; and through nearly two hundred years, its evil purpose had appeared to be nearly achieved. But in the mind of Wycliffe, the opinions which persecution had consigned to the most cautious secrecy, were generously embraced. Even his labours may be described as premature, but the shadowy interval between his decease and the appearance of the great German reformer, passes away like those mists which frequently linger for a while on the morning horizon, as if to heighten the contrast between the twilight and the day." I. pp. 213, 214.

Of the earlier part of Wycliffe's life little is known, except that it was spent entirely or chiefly at Oxford, and occupied, doubtless, in a great measure, by the then prevalent pursuits and studies of the place. In these there is every reason to believe that he became no mean proficient; but it is impossible to suppose that they entirely engrossed his attention. We have not, indeed, in his works, any record of his devotion to other more important inquiries which can be referred to this period, but the rich display of theological and practical wisdom which distinguished his later years, and the rapid profusion with which these treasures were poured forth, cannot be accounted for except on the presumption that he had long been engaged in their accumulation, and that in secret he had long formed and matured those views, not only of the usurpation, but of the antichristian faith of the Romish church, which waited for a more favourable combination of events to bring them to light.

"While, however, it would have been indeed surprising if Wycliffe had not imbibed the sentiment of the age, respecting the importance of this philosophy, it was almost impossible that such a mind should have become so completely versed in its principles, without some misgivings as to the justice of its vast pretensions.

“It is at the same time due to its votaries to state, that in the writings of schoolmen, amid much that is sceptical in its tendency, and more that is useless or puerile, the truths of the gospel are not unfrequently to be discovered; and that they are sometimes exhibited on a scale of correctness, and marked by a purity of application, which would have done honour to men of any later period. That the mind of Wycliffe derived a portion of its light from this source is certain; and it is equally evident that others were thus in some degree prepared to receive his more peculiar doctrine. From his writings we learn that he never wholly abandoned the scholastic topics of discussion, nor its methods of reasoning. From the same source, however, we also learn, that in the art of wisely separating the precious from the vile, he far surpassed the most enlightened of his countrymen. To remove the errors which treachery or ignorance has been long employed in interweaving with the truth, and to preserve the latter uninjured, must ever be a work of difficulty. In the age of Wycliffe, when the false had acquired so complete an ascendancy over the true, it was a task of eminent peril. His ardent attachment to the Sacred Scriptures, which at length procured him the appellation of the ‘Gospel Doctor,’ could not have been disclosed without considerable hazard to his reputation as a scholar. For such was the prevailing contempt of the sacred writings, or the mistakes of men induced by the papal doctrine of infallibility as to the uses to which they should be applied, that an adherence to that volume, even as a text book, was sufficient to induce the leading universities of Europe to exclude the offender from their walls. Friar Bacon, and Grossteste, the celebrated Bishop of Lincoln, honoured the cause of these persecuted teachers with their pleadings; but their arguments and their influence were put forth in vain. In the age of our reformer, men may have begun to discover that their ‘seraphic’ instructors, in promising them wisdom, had pledged themselves for more than was performed. But it yet seemed to require the whole of Wycliffe’s acknowledged talent to give popularity to the exploded custom of lecturing on morals and divinity from the pages of holy writ. The charge, either of ignorance or of incapacity, as preferred against him, was known to be perilous; accordingly his opponents invariably accuse him of design, rather than of weakness.”—Pp. 234—236.

The first occasion which brought Wycliffe prominently into notice (about the year 1360) was his controversy with the mendicant friars, whose errors and vices had never before been so forcibly assailed, and whose vehement hostility he consequently encountered on every subsequent occasion. Shortly afterwards he was brought into collision with them at the papal court, in consequence of his appointment to the wardenship of Canterbury Hall; and it deserves to be mentioned as a striking proof of the independence of his mind, that at the time when this suit was pending, he took an active and spirited part in the controversy occasioned by the pope’s most unseasonable demand from Edward III. of the ignominious *census* originally exacted from John. It is scarcely necessary to add, that he lost his suit at Rome; but these were considerations which never weighed with him when the cause either of religion or of his country called for his exertions. From this time forward he frequently appears as the active agent or counsellor of the government, or of parliament, in their disputes with the pope, and his pen was ever ready to expose the abuses and corruptions both of the court of Rome and of the clergy in general. His appointment to the professorship of divinity at Oxford, which occurred in the year 1372, tended greatly to increase his influence, and afforded him a most important field for its exercise. Here there can be no doubt that he greatly added to the number of his followers and admirers, and unfolded to his pupils with less reserve the theological tenets in which he differed from the church of Rome. But these are more fully developed in the variety of pieces, chiefly in English, which



are referred to the later years of his life after the interference of the papal authority had succeeded in procuring his exclusion from the university. These writings appear to have been eagerly sought after, and circulated as extensively as the limited means which could be employed for that purpose, before the invention of printing, would permit; as indeed we might infer from the number of copies of many of them which are still in existence, notwithstanding the diligence which was afterwards employed, during the persecution of his followers, to search out and destroy them.

There is good reason to believe that the writings of Wycliffe had a considerable influence on the doctrine afterwards maintained by the reformers of Bohemia. He himself, however, did not probably derive his opinions either from the Waldenses or any of those who had gone before him in protesting against the prevalent usurpations and corruptions. The writings of the most eminent of the fathers and the pages of inspiration were familiar to him at an early period, and to the end of his career these, as far as can be discerned, were almost exclusively his guides. Hence, in opposing the spiritual power of the popes, and certain doctrinal corruptions of the hierarchy, the reformer evidently regards himself as associated with the devout men of very remote ages, but as standing almost alone in later times. The zeal, fervour, and eloquence, of his invectives against the corruptions of the Romish church, are not inferior to those of Luther himself, and indicate, if possible, a still more highly-toned courage, inasmuch as he did not enjoy, like the German reformer, a protection from the civil power which secured the latter, for the most part, from personal danger. Indeed, on reading the open and undisguised avowals of doctrines stigmatized by the church as heretical, and the indignant exposures of the multiplied enormities of the pope, the clergy, and the friars, which abound in all his writings, one is apt to wonder by what combination of circumstances it happened that he did not undergo the same fate to which the bloody and vindictive spirit of an irritated priesthood, not long afterwards, doomed the most illustrious of his disciples. Some have even insinuated that he escaped, on one occasion at least, by a temporizing policy, playing the hero while the danger was distant, and a less reputable character when it came near. But this charge appears to be quite unfounded. It is true that his confession on the subject of the eucharist, as presented to the papal delegates, contains several strong expressions which go considerably further than any sect of Protestants, unless it be the Lutherans, could follow him; it also abounds in scholastic expressions, and what appear to us minute and frivolous distinctions; at the same time he decidedly denies the actual change of the substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, which is the distinguishing feature of the Romish doctrine. And we need not be told that the *odium theologicum* is not unfrequently in the inverse ratio of the importance of the points of difference.

We must look for other causes of the comparative immunity which Wycliffe was permitted to enjoy, in the powerful personal influence he exercised at Oxford, in his popularity with the citizens, in the protection of John of Gaunt, and, above all, in the papal schism which commenced at this critical period, and so unpleasantly occupied the attention of the church. These causes probably arrested, from time to time, the arm of vengeance, till its destined victim had finished his appointed work, and was removed beyond its reach. But many passages are quoted by Mr. V. which evidently indicate a mind fully nerved to meet the last conflict, and prepared to encounter opposition and persecution in their most formidable



shape in support of what he believed to be his Master's cause. Knowing, as he must have done, the temper of the men he had to deal with, he cannot but have been fully aware that he had already committed offences in their eyes not to be forgiven, and which rendered retreat impossible.

The theological sentiments of Wycliffe being mainly derived, like those of Luther, from his familiarity with the writings of Augustine, considerably resemble the systems which, among Protestants of the present day, have nearly appropriated to themselves the epithet *orthodox*. Original sin, the election of grace, predestination, and final perseverance, are all enumerated as parts of his creed. Trinitarian forms and doxologies continually occur; but in what precise manner he would have expressed his view of this doctrine does not clearly appear. According to our author, he seems at least to have considered it as so far within the range of human reason as to admit of illustration by a reference to certain natural appearances. In the first book of his treatise entitled *Triologus*, where he discusses a series of questions relating to the existence and perfections of the Deity, the doctrine of the Trinity, we are told,

"—is of course discussed, and some attention is bestowed on certain natural appearances which was [were] supposed to illustrate that mysterious truth. After some remarks on the theories of Plato and Aristotle, respecting ideas, the writer concludes with a censure on the papal authority; as by sanctioning the doctrine which declared the sacred host to be an accident without a subject, it had affirmed that to be true, which no mind may possibly comprehend. In a previous conversation relating to the mystery of the Trinity, the reformer had observed, 'Some men are so strangely mistaken in judging on this subject, as to suppose that the light of faith is contrary to that of nature; and accordingly, that what may seem impossible to the latter, should be implicitly received upon the testimony of the former. But the truth is, men call their own darkness the light of nature, and hence weakly suppose that the light of reason and of Scripture are at variance with each other.' Thus also, in concluding the above observation on the eucharist, it is remarked, that 'God teaches us the truth, and nothing but the truth, and what may be known by us to be such.' This doctrine is inculcated for the immediate purpose of exposing the necessary falsehood of transubstantiation; but it is also urged in this, and in other instances, to secure to the reason of man its due influence with respect to religious faith in general; and the ingenuity of the writer is successfully employed to vindicate his assent to the doctrine of the Trinity, while rejecting the dogmas which had corrupted the eucharist."—II. p. 211.

From this passage it would appear, that Wycliffe considered the Trinity as not so inconsistent with the suggestions of natural reason as transubstantiation. His biographer, too, seems to be of the same opinion; and it is remarkable that, in another place, as the strongest form in which he could express the absurdity of the Romish tenet, he describes it as requiring for its reception precisely that state of the intellectual powers which a late distinguished advocate of the Trinity has demanded from its votaries.

"It is," says he, "by no means surprising, that a study of the Scriptures, which had been devoutly pursued through so long an interval, and which had produced a renunciation of so many established opinions, should issue in the abandonment of a doctrine containing the grossest of the insults which priests, in the insolence of triumph, had bestowed on the *prostrate capacities* of their victims."—II. p. 78.

To us the two doctrines seem, in this respect, pretty nearly on a level; and we are glad to perceive that the controversy now so actively maintained between the Catholics and the Established Church is leading more and

more to the conviction that they are also nearly alike in the authority on which they rest. The Romanist has clearly shewn that, if his antagonist confines himself to the Scriptures, there exist no principles on which he can reject transubstantiation, which will not enable the Unitarian to disprove the Trinity; and on the other hand, if he admits church authority to be of *any* weight in the controversy, he cannot place the Trinity on any basis on which the papist cannot equally establish the doctrine of his church.

The literary execution of these volumes is, on the whole, very respectable; making allowance for the frequent recurrence of one or two favourite but unusual forms of expression. We may add, that the affectation of continually styling his hero "the Rector of Lutterworth," merely in order to avoid the reiteration of his name, appears to us in very bad taste. But these are slighter matters; and we take our leave of the author with feelings of gratitude for much interesting information, in imparting which he has contributed a valuable addition to the treasures of ecclesiastical biography.

---

ART. II.—*A Connexion of Sacred and Profane History from the Death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah, intended to complete the Works of Shuckford and Prideaux.* By the Rev. M. Russell, LL.D., Episcopal Minister, Leith.

(Continued from p. 561.)

PROCEEDING with our analysis of this work, we come now to the third section of the second chapter, which is allotted to an examination into the History and Object of the Idolatrous Practices of the Jews prior to their Captivity in Babylon. Notwithstanding they were set apart by Providence for the purpose of preserving in the world the knowledge and worship of the one God, it is well known that the Israelites, during the early part of their history, always manifested a tendency towards idolatry. Their long residence in Egypt, and their settlement in a land where they were surrounded by idolatrous nations, had infected their minds so strongly, that not even the severe laws of Moses, nor all the miracles they witnessed, could overcome their infatuation, till a revolution took place in the state of human thought and manners in the east. When Cyrus extended his dominion over Western Asia, the similarity of the Jewish creed to that of the Persians produced in the mind of the conqueror friendly sentiments towards the Hebrews.

"The worship of one God no longer had to struggle as before with the practice and opinions of mankind, and from this time we find the Jews such zealous worshipers of Jehovah, that the Greeks could not, even by the fiercest persecutions, cause them to abandon the religion of their prophets."

The nations of Canaan, like other idolatrous people, had mingled together in their religious rites and worship the various forms of Sabaism, Hero worship, and the substitution of emblems. And with respect to the Hebrews,

"They made a distinction between worshipping strange gods and paying their adoration to Jehovah through the medium of idolatrous emblems. For example, they allowed it to be quite inconsistent with the fundamental

principles of their religious polity to offer sacrifice to Baal or Moloch, but they did not imagine it could be wrong to serve the true God by setting up calves to represent the Divine Nature, or by forming images to decorate their high places and consecrated groves."

In the reformation effected by the good kings, the calves, the images, the high places, were not removed till the accession of Josiah. The device of Jeroboam was but a schism, it did not involve his kingdom in apostacy, and even Jehu in his zeal for Jehovah did not destroy the golden calves which were in Bethel and in Dan. Ahab was the first who openly countenanced the worship of foreign divinities. Baal in the singular, according to the Sabaists, was the Sun, and the plural of the term was applied to the Host of Heaven; but the word, both in the singular and the plural, was not unfrequently used in the Hebrew in reference to the true God, which our author considers as another proof that the Deity was often worshiped by the Israelites under the name and figure of an idol. Our limits will not permit us to follow Dr. Russell through all his details on this subject. He accords with the most eminent mythologists in concluding that the foundation of mythology rests on the two great principles which secure the perpetuity of nature. To these must be traced the origin of Baal, Baal-peor, Baalzebub, Chemosh, Moloch, Astarte, &c., &c., all of which, however, may also be considered as personifications of the sun, the moon, and the stars, as well as of the productive and prolific powers of nature, in the worship of which cruelty, profligacy and absurdity were combined. And the Israelites, having brought some idolatrous practices from Egypt, "adopted some of the most offensive of those which they found among the tribes whom they were commanded to extirpate." And in defiance of the power of their more enlightened judges and pious kings, "they persisted in their idolatry, with a degree of steadiness which they manifested in no other pursuit, till at length, towards the close of their monarchy, we find them combining in one scheme of false worship, the superstitions of the Nile, with the Sabaism of Chaldea, and the carnal ceremonies of the seven nations."

The third chapter contains the General History of the Hebrews, from the Death of Joshua to the Reign of Saul. The policy adopted by the Israelites on taking possession of Canaan was injurious to their safety as well as to the purity of their religion. They allowed the idolaters to dwell with them in the land, and to mix with them in the same cities; in consequence of which they became luxurious and effeminate, and the federal union of their tribes was virtually dissolved. The Israelites had been settled in the land twenty years before they were deprived of their victorious leader. While he lived, his example and authority restrained them; and the remembrance of the miraculous interpositions which they had witnessed, could not be effaced from their recollection, nor suffer them to be generally infected by the surrounding idolatry. Joshua, and the generation which had lived with him, had doubtless passed away before the people apostatized, and were first reduced to servitude under Chushan Rishathaim. Placing events in chronological order, according to the system laid down in the preliminary dissertation, a longer interval must have taken place between the death of Joshua and the authority of Othniel, than is usually allowed. This seems necessary to account for the people having arrived at such a pitch of practical idolatry as to bring upon them so severe a chastisement as was inflicted by means of the Mesopotamian monarch. The deliverance under Othniel was the time at which the government under Judges took its



rise, previous to which, from the death of Joshua, a state of anarchy prevailed.

We cannot follow our author through the whole of the narrative, which is well told, and abounds with sensible and useful reflections; among which we would particularly notice his remarks on the treacherous and cruel conduct of Jael towards her victim Sisera, and the inhuman sacrifice which Jephthah made of his daughter—a sacrifice utterly inconsistent with the law delivered by Moses, and which plainly shewed that the freebooter who had been raised to the command of the armies of Israel, was tainted with the horrid idolatry of Moloch, and that the people who could witness it were equally infected. The High Priest could not have been concerned in the transaction, since Shiloh was in the tribe of Ephraim, with which Jephthah was at variance, and against which he made a murderous expedition. The father was himself the only priest on the unhallowed occasion.

During the whole period from their settlement in Canaan to the establishment of the monarchy, the Hebrews

“—were in one of the simplest forms of society. They had emerged from the state of the wandering shepherd, and were about to assume the more improved habits of the agriculturist. Their civil government was closely modelled on the pattern of domestic rule which originally guided the affairs of each patriarch's family, while they were yet following their herds in the deserts of Syria. Their laws, too, respecting property were calculated to perpetuate that equality of condition which became the children of the same father, and upon which the foundations of their commonwealth were laid. We find no distinctions of rank among them, but such as arose from age or office. Their magistrates were the elders of the people, assisted by the Levites, who expounded the law and enforced its sanctions; and their leaders in war were the princes and heads of families, who were allowed to invite to a share in their command any individual whose skill and courage promised success in the field of battle.”

We find not in the Judges any of those milder moral virtues which now constitute the grace and ornament of life; they were appointed for offices which the peculiar circumstances of the people rendered necessary. The uncommon and supernatural strength of body and of mind which some of them possessed, were united with the fierce passions and gross manners of barbarians. We may admire the courage, the heroism of Gideon, Jephthah, or Samson, but there is nothing else in the characters worthy of imitation. All that can be said of them is, they were proper instruments for the work to which they were appointed. In theology alone, the Israelites were raised above all the other nations of the earth, though their practice too frequently opposed their faith. They alone, in their public religion, avowed the absolute unity of the Creator of all things, the simplest and the grandest truth that ever took possession of the human mind.

The second book contains Remarks on the History of the Oriental Nations, as connected with that of the Hebrew People, and first of the Babylonians and Assyrians. Previous to the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, the Assyrian Empire extended in the South to the Persian Gulf, and the deserts which divide Media from the banks of the Indus. Our author is disposed to attribute the character of fidelity and exactness to the lists of Babylonian and Assyrian kings preserved by Ctesias and others; first, because the people of the East, particularly the tribes of Arabia and Syria, have taken great pains to preserve their genealogies and the entire

record of their principal families. There was no temptation to corrupt or to destroy these lists, therefore most probably they have been correctly preserved. There is not the same reliance to be placed on their warlike exploits and other achievements. Different talents are requisite to give a simple narrative of events, and to construct a family record. The extent of dominion, the magnificence of cities, the number and splendour of the troops, may be exaggerated, while the order of succession may be correctly recorded. It is not so certain that Ninus conducted his armies from the borders of India to the river of Egypt, nor that Semiramis surrounded a space of ground, sixty miles in circumference, with walls a hundred feet high, as it is that Ninus reigned over the Assyrians and was succeeded by his wife Semiramis.

In opposition to the opinions of the learned in almost every age, Dr. Russell is disposed to pay respect to Ctesias, as far as concerns his catalogue of Assyrian kings, and the series of dates which he is supposed to have transcribed from the archives of the Persian Court, in the reign of Artaxerxes Mnemon. The discrepancy in different editions of the same catalogue is no proof of forgery or of corruption, nor is the giving of different names to the same persons an uncommon thing, especially in oriental history. There may, however, be some reason to suspect that authors have sometimes altered the catalogues which have come into their hands, with a view of accommodating them to their own system of dates.

Shuckford, following the Masoretic Jews, dates the commencement of the Assyrian Empire at one hundred and one years after the flood. It is not to be imagined that the human race had increased in that period to such a degree as to found such cities and countries as are named in Genesis. A well-merited portion of ridicule is directed against Bishop Cumberland's system, which, in three hundred and forty years after the flood, makes the population of the world amount to 3,333,333,330 males, each provided with a wife. The greater probability is, that the whole number, at one hundred and one years after the flood, did not exceed one thousand, from whom we should not be disposed to look for any large establishment. After an elaborate comparison of ancient records, and examination of various chronological authorities, having placed his statements in different points of view, Dr. Russell concludes that Nimrod commenced his empire A. C. 2566, or six hundred and nineteen years after the deluge; that there were three dynasties reigning at Babylon from Nimrod, previous to the conquest of the Chaldaean territory by Ninus, the last of which, however, is doubtful: therefore omitting this, and assigning to the other two a period of four hundred and forty years, he fixes the commencement of the Assyrian Empire in 2126 A. C.

The second chapter contains an outline of such parts of the ancient history of the Hebrews as may seem to have been affected by the power or character of the neighbouring nations. The birth of Abraham is fixed by our author in the thirteenth year of the reign of Ninus. The state of society at that time bore no resemblance to the constitution and polity of populous countries that have made any advancement in civilization. From the patriarchal form of government, increasing numbers will necessarily advance towards a state in which the several branches from the parent stock shall be held together by some bond of union. Thus arises the system of clanship, which appears to have been the state of society in Asia at this time, and Ninus most probably was at the head of a large number of tribes or clans, who paid respect to him as chief of the largest and most powerful

clan, with which the others were united either by ties of consanguinity, or a sense of inferior strength.

"The kings of Elam, of Shinar, of Ellasar, and their confederate Tidal, the king of nations, on the one hand, and Bera and Birsha, with their allies, on the other, were nothing more than the heads of clans, who enjoyed the privilege of carrying away one another's cattle, or imposing a tribute as a price of forbearance. They are, it is true, called kings, and so were the Dukes of Edom, and as every head of a house who owned a flock, and could protect it in the desert or on the mountain, was entitled to the proud appellation of a King of Edom, so every chieftain in Elam or Shinar who could muster men enough to form a marauding expedition, was known by his enemies as well as by his friends, as a king of those countries."

The King of Mesopotamia, who was the first instrument in the hands of the Almighty for punishing the ingratitude and idolatry of the chosen people, was not the Assyrian monarch. In the time of the Hebrew judges, the dominion of Assyria did not extend westward of the Euphrates. It is more probable that the King of Mesopotamia was at the head of an independent and separate state. After this king was defeated by Othniel, the next people who oppressed the Israelites were the Moabites, who were the descendants of Lot. On their march from Egypt to Canaan, the Israelites had been forbidden to waste the lands or injure the persons of the Moabites. The apprehensions raised by so numerous a body of invaders were not removed by this peaceful conduct, and fearing to attack them in the field, the chief of Moab, by the insidious counsel of Balaam, tried the more safe and efficacious method of corruption. Enmity was thus excited, and after a lapse of seventy or eighty years in conjunction with Ammon and Amalek, they invaded the invaders, but their military force was so broken by the stratagem of Ehud, that they made no further attack on the Hebrews during the time of the Judges. After this follows an account of this people, till they were finally subdued by Nebuchadnezzar. The Canaanites are the next people brought to our notice; a powerful and warlike race, said to have derived their lineage from Canaan, and at an early period to have branched out into eleven distinct tribes or nations. These people, it is well known, resisted the invasion of their country with great spirit and perseverance. Every clan acknowledged the authority of its own chief, who, in the Hebrew records, is called king; and it is probable that the thirty-one kings who were conquered by Joshua, were all included in the seven nations which he was enjoined to destroy. Their early history is little known. It is certain that their tribes were not all expelled or exterminated by the invasion of the Hebrews, for they were afterwards powerful enough to reduce Israel to subjection, till the success of Barak delivered them from their servitude.

The Midianites are thought to have descended from Midian, the fourth son of Abraham by Keturah. They were, at a very early period, divided into two classes, the pastoral and the mercantile, and are supposed by some to have attained to some degree of learning and science. They are also thought to have preserved the worship of one God.

"Job, who is supposed to have lived in those early days, presents a fine example of an enlightened Theist, who had not only studied the mechanism of the material world, but had also founded upon his physical researches the wisest and most consolatory doctrines relative to the Divine attributes. Jethro again, one of the priests of the tribe, possessed a mind much too elevated to stoop to the degrading usages of the popular superstition."



One branch of the nation was destroyed by Moses, but the remainder were afterwards powerful enough to drive the Israelites from the low country into the mountains, till the decisive victory of Gideon put an end to the oppression. The Midianites, in latter times, have merged into the more general appellation of Arabians.

The Philistines are supposed to have come originally from Egypt. They were a warlike people living on the western borders of Judea. Their most ancient form of government appears to have been monarchical, and their kings were all addressed by the affectionate title of Abimelech, which literally means, *My Father the King*. This was afterwards changed into an aristocracy, under the direction of five lords or provincial governors. This was the form subsisting during the time of the Hebrew judges, but afterwards the regal power was restored. As they did not belong to the aboriginal tribes of the country which was promised to Abraham and his seed, they were not to be driven out. They were, however, bigoted idolaters, and hated the Israelites. They were long the most formidable enemies whom the Israelites had to encounter, till their power was broken by David. After this they are not mentioned till the accession of Nadab King of Israel, when they again renewed their struggle for superiority, till, with their rivals, they were reduced under subjection to the Assyrians.

The Ammonites were descended from Lot, and owing to the relationship which subsisted between them and the descendants of Abraham, they were not molested by the Hebrews in their march towards Canaan, till their own fears involved them in the calamities they wished to avoid. They afterwards united with Eglon, and made an attempt singly to recover the lands of which their ancestors had been deprived, but were defeated by Jephthah. Their hostility continued with few intervals till their capital was taken by David. Their name seldom occurs afterwards in history; they appear, however, to have had a large army in the time of the Maccabees, and their name did not cease to exist till, in the second century of the Christian era, they were absorbed in the power of Arabia.

Some obscurity hangs over the origin of the Amalekites, who are said by some to have descended from Esau, while the Arabians trace the lineage up to Uz, the grandson of Noah. They were, at a very remote period, a powerful and a jealous people, and attacked the Israelites on their march from the Red Sea. Their hostility towards the Israelites continued till their total defeat by David, after which their name scarcely occurs.

The Syrians were anciently, like the other countries of Western Asia, under the government of petty kings or heads of clans who divided their fine country, and rendered it unavailable either for conquest or defence. We hear nothing of the Syrians during the time of the Judges in Israel. Dr. Russell has, however, pursued his researches through the period of the kingly government, and detailed the wars of Benhadad and Hazael.

An abridgement of the history of the Phœnicians follows, about whose origin much difference of opinion exists among biblical critics and antiquaries. That they were Canaanites appears to be the more probable conjecture. Like all other ancient states, it was at an early period divided into several independent kingdoms—of which Sidon has always been esteemed the oldest and most powerful; but so few notices of it are to be met with in the Scriptures, that nothing more is known than that it existed in opulence and splendour in the earliest times. Tyre, less ancient, holds a more conspicuous place in the annals of Syria than Sidon, from which she sprung, and to whose wealth and power she succeeded at an early

period, exercising dominion over the parent city. Tyre was a strong city in the days of Joshua. Herodotus says, that in his time the Tyrians boasted that their temple and town had stood 2300 years, which carries us back to the beginning of the fifth century after the flood. Josephus, on the other hand, dates its origin at not more than 240 years before the building of Solomon's Temple. Dr. Hales conjectures, that Josephus must have written 1240, and that the numerical letter denoting a thousand, has been omitted by the carelessness of some transcriber. Tyre certainly possessed a high antiquity, but no existing records carry back the history much higher than the time of David, in whose reign, and in that of his successor, the friendly intercourse between Tyre and Israel is well known. The idolatrous worship of Astarte was introduced into Israel by Jezebel, who was daughter of Ithobal or Ethbaal, King of Tyre, during the reign of Ahab: from this time Tyre was but little connected with the history of the Israelites; Dr. Russell has, however, traced the narrative down to a very late period.

The third chapter treats of the ancient Persian monarchy, which had no immediate connexion with the Hebrews during the period when the government of the Judges prevailed. The native annals of Persia are full of romance; and previous to the æra of Grecian history no account can be had respecting the affairs of Iran. The scanty information which the Scripture affords, only tells us that Chedorlaomer engaged his vassals or confederates against the Kings of Pentapolis; and Josephus merely tells us, that Elam gave birth to the Elamites. From other sources, however, Dr. Russell has with great diligence and learning constructed a narrative of the early affairs of Iran, Elam, or Persia, which possesses considerable interest, but of which we cannot attempt to give an epitome, as it would too much exceed our limits.

The fourth chapter gives an account of the origin of the more remarkable states of ancient Greece. Here is given us a copy of the Parian Chronicle from the Arundel Marbles, followed by a translation and a Table of Olympiads, from Dr. Hales. The only connexion between the history of these states and that of the ancient Hebrews, is that which relates to time. Ægialeus, the first of the Sicyonian kings, ascended the throne in the days of Nahor, the grandfather of Abraham, and Moses died ten years before Cecrops placed himself at the head of the Athenians. The chapter contains much archæological investigation as well as diligent research into the mythology, customs, and manners of the ancient Grecian States, which appear to have borne a great resemblance to those of Western Asia in these respects; but as there is little connexion with the Hebrew history, we shall dismiss this chapter without further notice.

The fifth chapter adds another to the many unsuccessful attempts which have been made by learned men to fix the dates of the Argonautic expedition, the Trojan war, and the return of the Heraclidæ. Adhering chiefly to the authority of Jackson, Dr. Russell determines, from the circumstance of Hercules having received assistance from the Argonauts, in his war against Laomedon, that Jason's exploit must have taken place about the year 1224 or 1225, A. C.; of course he considers it as a real event, and not a poetic fiction. With equal confidence he places the Trojan war about the year 1183 or 1184, and the Dorian invasion of Peloponnesus, under the descendants of Hercules, in the year 1103. From a comparison of circumstances and dates it appears, that by the chronological system which Dr. Russell maintains, the Argonautic expedition sailed from Colchis about the time that Jephthah was delivering the Hebrews from the dominion of the

Ammonites; that the Trojan war took place during the sixth servitude of the Hebrews under the Philistines; and that the Dorian invasion took place during the government of Samuel.

“The political condition of the Hebrews, during the time of the Judges, bore a close resemblance to that of the smaller Greek states before the Trojan war. The Israelites, indeed, acknowledged the obligations of a close relationship in kindred and extraction, as well as the divine origin of their federal government, which rendered all the tribes amenable to the same paramount authority, and placed the means of public defence in the hands of their national council; but if we confine our survey to the actual practice of their constitution, we shall perhaps discover that every family or clan pursued its own interests without any reference to the general will, and had in return to sustain alone the attacks of its enemies.”

The alterations which took place in the system of government and the state of society, not only among the descendants of Israel but also in the surrounding nations after the introduction of the regal power, are to be the subject of a subsequent part of the work.

We have perused this book with much satisfaction; it is executed with great diligence, patience, and learning. Some of the chronological discussions, perhaps, might have been spared, since, after all, they do not lead to certainty on this difficult and intricate subject; but, on the whole, every thing that could tend to illustrate the manners, customs and habits of the people, their civil and political institutions, and their foreign relations, has been explored with exemplary industry, and with considerable talent. The style is perhaps in some instances somewhat too diffuse, but in general perspicuous and elegant. On the whole we do not hesitate to say, that it is a valuable addition to what has lately been called the literature of theology, and we anticipate with pleasure the appearance of the remaining volumes.

---

ART. III.—*Infant Baptism, the means of National Reformation, according to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England.* By the Rev. Henry Budd. Seeley.

THIS is a work deserving of attentive perusal both on the part of Dissenters and Churchmen. The arguments its author puts forth, if not new, are more broadly and candidly stated, and more with a view to practice, than arguments in favour of the National Church often are: and as they are brought forward in an attractive form, they are likely to have no little influence with the serious party in the Church to which Mr. Budd belongs.

The title is unfortunately chosen; for Mr. Budd's aim is to shew that something much beyond Infant Baptism is necessary to “National Reformation according to the Church of England;” and we are convinced he would not thank us for accepting his meagre title-page as a fair announcement of the contents of his book.

It is his opinion that the doctrine of Election is not only expressly taught by the articles of the Church of England, but also that it may be recognized in every part of her services; for, first, it is the foundation of the baptismal service. The believing parent is, Mr. Budd thinks, warranted by Scripture to infer that his child is an heir of the promise, i. e. elect, as well as himself.



In this faith he brings the child to the font ; the child is received at once into the bosom of the church, the whole congregation, as well as the immediate sponsors, undertaking to hold him as a regenerate brother ; the church all along presupposing the fact of the regeneration ; and, believing the parents' and sponsors' duties to be faithfully performed, proceeds through all her services upon this presumption.

For this, her legitimate child, are all her treasures collected. In the morning and the evening services, it is *him* alone whose wants and desires she meets. In the events of life, in marriage, at the birth of children, in sickness and at the tomb, still it is to him and of him only that she speaks. She has but one mode of address, and that is, an address to the elect. According to Mr. Budd's idea, therefore, some instances of alleged defectiveness in the rubric, are not defects but beauties. Clergymen have occasionally been startled, when called upon to visit the sick, at finding no provision for the case of the wicked and unconverted man ; and on uttering over the grave of a notorious unbeliever or contemner of God's law, the words "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to take to himself the soul of our dear brother departed ;"—but we find that the church knows nothing of bad men or infidels ; she proceeds throughout with an utter disdain of such digressions : hers is a community of saints ; and it is to them, and not to the world, that she speaks.

High pretensions these ! and yet Mr. Budd sets us the example of comparing profession with practice in many respects so very fairly, that if truth were here compatible with mere courtesy, we would leave him to finish what he has well begun. But it seems to us, that his censures are mainly directed against the body of the people, the inferior clergy, and a few derelictions from the original forms of the church ; and that he altogether leaves out of sight one great cause of indifference, disgust, and neglect. When a worldly and politic son of the church addresses the people in her favour and declaims against dissent, we commonly find the reasons he has to give have, at least, as far as they go, the merit of consistency ; but when a writer, eminent for spirituality, is also her advocate, this consistency becomes far more difficult, and it is evident that unless he be fearless, general, and unsparing in his condemnation of what is wrong, he has no chance at all with the serious reader. Whatever the church may be in her original constitution, *being what she is*, Mr. Budd must know that she is not now a spiritual church. We cannot conceive any thing more contradictory than the temper and spirit she requires from her baptized children, and the temper and spirit which, as it seems to us, is the spring of all her machinery. The hopes and fears of her ministers are continually excited by things temporal, nor is it always by the exertion of their powers in a legitimate direction that the desired success is obtained ; often it is purchased by qualities perfectly distinct from those which are of value in the eyes of a Christian ; often it is the result of a mere concurrence of worldly circumstances. And yet Mr. Budd can expect and require that sponsors should faithfully discharge their trusts, and "renounce the vain pomps and glory of the world, and all covetous desires of the same ;" he can lament over the unwillingness to incur this heavy responsibility, and can murmur at the wide-spreading evil of dissent, while he omits to acknowledge, before all things, the worldliness that so deeply infects the clerical character, and the system of patronage which unfortunately acts as a continual encouragement to the earthly, instead of the spiritual, energies of the church. Instead of frowning over the

multitude of Dissenters, surely such thinkers as Mr. Budd should glory in the increase of those faithful men, who, even while true to her doctrines, cannot partake of the good things which they feel to be ill-administered; who, even while they admire and would fain share in her services, yet seeing the hopeless prospect of reform from within, withdraw themselves from inconsistencies which they conceive to be manifest hindrances to the efficacy of all public ministrations.

It is general inconsistency then, the inconsistency of demanding from her *inferior* members that spirituality from which she has herself departed, that is the deep, radical sin of the church. She conceives herself to have a right not only to use the words, but to put forth the claims of a pure and un-earthly guardian, and to demand the renunciation of *that* which she has given no symptom of a desire to renounce for herself. When we see her putting off her earthly crown, presenting herself to the public with no claims but those of her own inherent excellence, displaying no golden baits, holding out no worldly terrors, relying on the spirit and power of truth, we then, from the spiritual mother, may look for spiritual children. Till then, we cannot allow that, if they are holy, it is because they are hers.

---

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

---

### ART. IV.—*Religious Discourses.* By a Layman. 8vo.

WE have, under this title, two discourses from the pen of the celebrated poet and novelist Sir Walter Scott. They are an object of curiosity and admiration, inasmuch as they evince in a new and peculiar manner the versatility of of the author's genius. But the reader will be disappointed who hopes to find in them "some of the most momentous questions which can exercise the human mind, discussed with great eloquence, ingenuity, and force of argument," which the writer of the preface leads him to expect.

The author, in a letter to the friend for whose benefit they were published, prefixed to them, gives the more just estimate of his productions, "that they contain no novelty of sentiment, and no attempt at brilliancy of composition." "They were meant, I may remind you," continues Sir Walter, "to shew that a rational and practical discourse upon a particular text is a task more easily performed than you, in your natural anxiety, seemed at the time disposed to believe." We do not mean to say that it is a very difficult task, but Sir Walter Scott's experience of what is easy or

difficult in the way of composition can hardly furnish a criterion for another. Written with a purely benevolent intention, and published on the part of the author with a reluctance only overcome by a similar feeling, they deserve to be read with indulgence, and they may undoubtedly be read with pleasure and improvement. They are plain, simple, and unaffected discourses, written in the author's pleasing, easy, and elegant style.

They are for the most part adapted to all classes of Christians; but at the close of the first sermon the author seems to slide into orthodox language as most familiar to him in writing on such subjects, and in a manner which makes us a little curious to know whether Sir Walter is a sincere believer in the doctrines of the Atonement and Original Sin, as commonly received, or has merely adopted the expressions out of accommodation to the friend for whom he wrote. Speaking of Christ he says, "He paid in his own inestimable person that debt which fallen man owed to Almighty Justice, and which, bankrupt by nature, it was impossible for him to discharge."

The first sermon is on Matt. v. 17: "Think not that I am come to destroy



the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." The object of it is to shew that Judaism was intended to be the foundation of Christianity, and that the Mosaic institutions were designed to typify the agents of the Christian dispensation.

The second discourse is an exposition of the first Psalm. It reminded us of Mr. Belsham's sermon on the same subject, in the first of the volumes lately published, in which a similar train of sentiment is pursued, and which will certainly lose nothing by comparison. We give with pleasure an extract from the Layman's Discourse, which we are sure will meet with approbation proportioned to the truth and importance of the observations it contains, and recommend them strongly to the attention of our readers.

"*Thirdly. Nor sitteth he, whom the Psalmist describes, in the seat of the scornful.* There is a grave and delusive reasoning which causeth to err—there is an *example of sin* which is more seductive than sophistry—but there is a third, and to many dispositions a yet more formidable mode of seduction, arising from evil communication. It is the fear of ridicule, a fear so much engrafted on our nature, that many shrink with apprehension from the laugh of scorers, who could refute their arguments, resist their example, and defy their violence. There has never been an hour or an age, in which this formidable weapon has been more actively employed against the Christian faith than our own day. Wit and ridicule have formed the poignant sauce with which infidels have seasoned their abstract reasoning, and voluptuaries the swinish messes of pollution, which they have spread unblushingly before the public. It is a weapon suited to the character of the Apostate Spirit himself, such as we conceive him to be—loving nothing, honouring nothing, feeling neither the enthusiasm of religion nor of praise, but striving to debase all that is excellent, and degrade all that is noble and praiseworthy, by cold irony and contemptuous sneering.

"We are far from terming a harmless gratification of a gay and and lively spirit sinful or even useless. It has been said, and perhaps with truth, that there are tempers which may be won to religion, by indulging them in their natural bent towards gaiety. But supposing it true that a jest *may* sometimes hit him who flies a sermon, too surely there are a hundred cases for one where the sermon

cannot remedy the evil which a jest has produced. According to our strangely varied faculties, our sense of ridicule, although silent, remains in ambush and upon the watch during offices of the deepest solemnity, and actions of the highest sublimity; and if aught happens to call it into action, the sense of the ludicrous becomes more resistless from the previous contrast, and the considerations of decorum, which ought to restrain our mirth, prove like oil seethed upon the flame. There is also an unhappy desire in our corrupt nature, to approve of audacity even in wickedness, as men chiefly applaud those feats of agility which are performed at the risk of the artist's life. And such is the strength and frequency of this unhallowed temptation, that there are perhaps but few who have not at one time or other fallen into the snare, and laughed at that at which they ought to have trembled. But, O my soul, come not thou into their secret, nor yield thy part of the promised blessing, for the poor gratification of sitting in the seat of the scorner, and sharing in the unprofitable mirth of fools, which is like the crackling of thorns under the pot!"—Pp. 59—63.

---

ART. V.—*Remarks on Religious Liberty, and the Duty of Nonconformity to Human Prescriptions in Religion; with an Appendix, illustrating the Beneficial Influence of Dissent on the National Interest.* 8vo. pp. 63. London. Holdsworth. 1828.

THERE is a more sturdy and zealous spirit of Dissent embodied in this pamphlet than has of late been commonly to be met with. The writer is in good earnest; and he gives no quarter to established religions, of however modified a description. He strikes at the principle of an Establishment as unchristian, and his blows are very effective—in our apprehension, decisive; at least so far as Establishment implies peculiar advantage to the votaries of some particular form of faith or worship. His objections to "a universal plan of endowing all sects, or of giving salaries to all religious teachers, of whatever sentiments and name," are less convincing. We cannot agree with him that the payment of a tax, levied by the proper authorities, some part of whose proceeds might be, in our opinion, applied "to



the civil maintenance of falsehood and delusion," would be "the commission of a known crime;" nor that it "must necessarily create resistance," any more than the payment of tithes. We coincide, however, in his conclusion, that "were all civil governors to confine their attention to the legitimate objects and ends of civil legislation, leaving religion to take its course by its own power and resources, or lending it their sanction only in a moral respect, they would best secure its real interests, and furnish less occasion for dissatisfaction in any class of their subjects."

The style is chaste and nervous. We extract the following remarks on the formality of Church-of-England religion, as a specimen of the author's manner:

"Nor can I in this place fully expose, although I cannot refrain from touching upon, the dreadful influence of that mechanical routine of ecclesiastical observances, which is all that multitudes in England know of what they are told is Christianity and religion. The church of God has never been in much danger from an undervaluing of the external ordinances of religion. The danger has generally been of an opposite kind. The great evil to be deprecated has always been the substitution of forms for the power of godliness, the sign for the thing signified, and a ritual obedience for spiritual holiness. The disobedient Jew has trusted to his natural descent from Abraham, and to his circumcision for salvation; the ignorant and vicious papist believes that the sacraments and the absolution will save him; and how many thousands equally disobedient, ignorant, and vicious, in our own land, have lived and died with a lie in their right hand! Taught from their earliest years by their own venerable and apostolic church, that they were 'regenerated in baptism,' and thereby made 'members of Christ,' 'children of God,' and 'inheritors of the kingdom of heaven;' confirmed afterwards in the delusion by the imposition of episcopal hands, recognized as Christians ever after; and, however immoral, admitted as such to the table of the Lord; absolved from all their sins on their death-bed by their Saviour, the clergyman, and receiving the sacramental passport to heaven from his hands, they die; the survivors hear thanks given to God for taking their souls to himself; and in perfect consistency with the whole delusion, their bodies are buried,

in certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life; and all this takes place continually, without any inquiring into the evidences of conversion of heart, and even in the face of innumerable proofs of an impenitent, unbelieving, wicked mind! And this is called the apostolical Christian church!"—Pp. 49, 50.

---

ART. VI.—*On some Corruptions of Scripture.* Pp. 28.

*On Tests of True Religion.* Pp. 20.

*On the Evidence necessary to establish the Doctrine of the Trinity.* Pp. 16.

*The Apostle Paul a Unitarian.* Pp. 35.

*Objections to Unitarian Christianity considered.* Pp. 18.

*A Serious and Friendly Address to every one who is halting between Two Opinions, and is willing to have his Doubts, Fears, and Suspicions removed.* Pp. 18.

THESE are Tracts published for the American Unitarian Association, and appear to us well calculated to diffuse correct information, and to remove many of the prejudices with which our system is regarded.

That which is entitled, "On some Corruptions of Scripture," conveys in plain, familiar conversation, the result of correct criticism in reference to the different passages of Scripture as relating to the Unitarian controversy, which are affected by Griesbach's emendations. We give the following as a specimen of the manner, p. 26:

"You said that there were different readings in different manuscripts. Why may not the alterations have been made by Unitarians; for I suppose some of the manuscripts were written by them, were they not?"

"*Min.* It is doubtful whether any now in existence were. During the dark ages, when most of the manuscripts now known were written, the Holy Scriptures were in the keeping of Trinitarians, who certainly would not suffer them to be altered to favour views which they deemed erroneous. Accordingly there is no evidence whatever of any change having been made in the manuscripts of the New Testament to favour the Unitarian scheme. This is a striking fact, and merits serious

consideration. Herbert Marsh, a learned Bishop of the Church of England, and a Trinitarian, virtually admits that the danger is from the opposite side. 'As,' he remarks, 'we have our manuscripts of the Greek Testament, not out of the hands of ancient heretics, but from the orthodox members of the Greek Church, we have less reason to apprehend that they have suffered, in points of doctrine, from heretical influence.' Lectures, Pt. I. p. 93."

The tract on "The Tests of True Religion," is, in the main, excellent. Acute and valuable remarks are offered to shew, that true religion is not necessarily evinced by its *seriousness*, (since a false religion may be serious too,) by *great and unusual feeling*, by a zeal about the *ritual observances* of piety, or by extraordinary *sacrifices* and *enterprises* in religion. The last topic leads to the observation,

"There are many who can think nothing a sacrifice, but the giving of—that dearest of all things to them—**MONEY**. The standing forth, for conscience' sake, as the mark of general obloquy, the being shunned and vilified, the bearing of hard names and cruel insinuations, the loss of reputation among the great body of the people, and the wounds of private friendship, all these things, in the common and worldly estimate, weigh as nothing in the balance with a few paltry items of dollars and cents!"—P. 13.

From the popular Tests of True Religion the author turns to the only true standard, the Scriptures.

"Surely the confidence with which these tests are brought forward ought to have some scriptural warrant. It is not for the want, on this subject, of *specifications* in the Bible, for it is full of them. We hear much of alms-deeds and charities, of visiting the widow and fatherless in their affliction, of self-control and meekness, of a gentle demeanour and a pure conduct; and yet, from all these, the public mind is turned away to certain things questionable in themselves, and yet much more questionable, as they are brought to serve the purposes of sectarian competition. Can any thing be more extraordinary—can any thing more strikingly indicate the thorough and yet unconscious perversion and sectarian bias of the whole religious mind of the country, than this fact, that nineteen times out of twenty you shall hear these questionable things urged to shew the superiority of the popular religion, and only the twentieth

time, if even then, shall a word be said about the great, the obvious, the abundant principles of evidence that are scattered up and down through the New Testament?"—P. 16.

The tract on "The Evidence necessary to establish the Doctrine of the Trinity," was written by the late Rev. S. C. Thacher, and was originally published as an Appendix to the American edition of Yates's Reply to Wardlaw. It may also be found at the end of the volume of Mr. Thacher's Sermons, printed after his death.

"There is scarcely any one who will deny that the doctrine of the Trinity is apparently inconsistent with the unity of God."—P. 6.

"In proportion as the previous presumption against any doctrine is strong, the evidence by which the presumption is to be set aside may be justly expected to be correspondently abundant and clear."—P. 9.

The writer contends, and we think justly, that if true, the doctrine must be proved from the New Testament alone. No one will say that a reader of the Old Testament *merely*, would find there any revelation of three distinct objects of supreme religious worship.

"Might we not expect, that our Lord himself would, at least *once*, have stated the doctrine of the Trinity in express language, and have insisted on the importance and necessity of believing it? Might we not suppose that in some one of nearly thirteen hundred times, in which the word *God* occurs in the New Testament, we should be expressly told, that the term is meant to include, not simply one, but three persons or subsistences, to each of which that title is applicable? Would neither our Lord, nor any one of his apostles, have left a single sentence in which the whole doctrine of the Trinity can be fully and accurately expressed?"

We are particularly struck with the following paragraph, and doubt not that it must stagger many a mind which now adopts the prevalent doctrine:

"If it should be said, that there might be reasons why our Lord did not *publicly* teach this doctrine, should we not expect some account of his *private* communications of it to his *disciples*? Would they have preserved no record of their first knowledge of a truth so wonderful and so essential a part of the Christian system? If we can suppose that our Saviour himself forbore to teach publicly that which was in fact the great principle on which his whole gospel



turned, why this reserve in his disciples? The Gospels were not written till several years after his death, and many of the Epistles still later; and should we have expected that they would not have given a hint of the time or the circumstances when this stupendous truth was unfolded to them? Observe in the Acts how minutely and fully the manner is declared in which the doctrine of the extension of Christianity to the Gentiles was unfolded. And could we have thought that the first revelation of the so much more difficult, and so much more incredible doctrine of the Trinity, would not have occupied a single line of the sacred history?"—P. 13.

The believer in that doctrine imagines, of course, that this has been done. Let him point it out.

The title of the next pamphlet had been previously adopted by an English writer. The line of argument is satisfactorily pursued, first, through the preaching of that Apostle, as found in the book of Acts, and, again, through his Epistles. The Epistle to the Hebrews, of which "there is not sufficient evidence that Paul was the author," is separately examined, and a similar result is obtained that the writer was a Unitarian.

Of the two smaller tracts which are placed last in our series, one contains a very judicious examination of the objections to Unitarian Christianity, and repels them in an ingenious manner and with excellent spirit. The last which it notices is, "that our views give no consolation in sickness and death." Of this objection, our own pages are continually affording the most ample refutation. We extract an additional instance from the tract before us.

"A striking example of the power of this system in disarming death was lately given by a young minister in a neighbouring town, (Rev. John E. Abbot, of Salem,) known to many of our readers, and singularly endeared to his friends by eminent Christian virtue. He was smitten by sickness in the midst of a useful and happy life, and sunk slowly to the grave. His religion, and it was that which has now been defended, gave habitual peace to his mind, and spread a sweet smile over his pale countenance. He retained his faculties to his last hour; and when death came, having left pious counsel to the younger members of his family, and expressions of gratitude to his parents, he breathed out life in the language of Jesus, 'Father, into thy

hands I commend my spirit.' Such was the end of one who held with an unwavering faith the great principles which we have advanced; and yet our doctrine has no consolation, we are told, for sickness and death!"—P. 18.

The last is no less excellent than the preceding. Its style is singularly affectionate. It conveys important information in a pleasing manner, and cannot fail always to conciliate and often to convince.

---

ART. VII.—*Two Discourses designed to illustrate in some particulars the Original Use of the Epistles of the New Testament, compared with their Use and Application at the present Day.* By the Rev. Orville Dewey, Pastor of the First Congregational Church in New Bedford. Boston, 1827. Pp. 35.

THE following general principle is laid down by our author, that "Paul, and it may be added, all the sacred writers did not deliver their instructions in an abstract and general form adapted alike and equally to all times, but that they had a local and special reference to the times in which they wrote."

After some observations on the local references in the Epistles, our author proceeds to remark,

"There is, indeed, what must have struck every attentive mind, a great difference between the instructions of our Saviour and his apostles, but it was a difference chiefly owing to circumstances. It was a difference not in the substance, but in the form, in the style of religious instruction. Our Saviour's teaching was evidently more simple, and more entirely practical. It dealt more in easy and intelligible expositions and illustrations of truth and duty, of piety and acceptance with God. Our Saviour was announcing a system which had not yet encountered objection. It could not meet with objection till it was announced. But the apostles had to contend with a world of objectors of every description. Hence their instructions became more speculative, more complicated, more intermixed with the institutions and ideas and prejudices of the age, and in just that proportion they became more argumentative and obscure."—P. 10.

The peculiar use of the terms *faith* and *justification* falls under our author's notice:



"The attempt to apply the apostolic views of faith and justification, in all their extent and frequency, to our experience, has been unfortunate, because it has led to unnatural, mystical ideas of religion, and among others, the preposterous notion, that the great obstacle to salvation, in the human heart, is not its bad passions, but some strange unwillingness to be saved by the mercy of God; and that faith being so exclusively and all-important, had some mysterious power of appropriating and securing the favour of God to itself. Indeed, faith has been often thought to be nothing else but a willingness to be saved."—P. 16.

The following paragraph suggests, we think, a valuable hint to a large class of religionists in this country:

"You must have reflected how much better and fitter it would have been, in that moment of imaginary or real conversion, for the subject of it, instead of coming forth to the multitude to tell what the Lord had done for his soul, how much better if he had gone away to his retired closet to pray, and to carry on the secret struggle of the religious life in his own bosom; how much better for him who thinks himself to have been a Christian but for one hour, or one day, in that day, in that hour, to be silent, thoughtful, diffident, anxious."—P. 18.

The preacher in the remainder of the first discourse, guards his hearers against the opposite mistake of supposing Scripture "to have little or no relation to us." We are much pleased with the following sentences:

"If we are worldly; if we are covetous and sensual; if we be guided by inclination rather than by duty, we need a conversion; not less than that which the Pagan experienced. If we are unkind, severe, censorious, or injurious, in the relations or the intercourse of life; if we are unfaithful parents, or undutiful children; if we are severe masters or faithless servants; if we are treacherous friends or bad neighbours, or bitter competitors, we need a conversion; we need a change greater than merely from Paganism to Christianity."—P. 19.

In the second discourse, the author had been speaking of the superstitious fear which exists in some minds of examining closely into the character and offices of Christ; and he plainly shews that these are proper subjects of investigation. We are happy to see the true medium between fanaticism and indifference so well pursued.

"Let me hear no more of admiration, of love, and joy, if he who has taught me peace of mind and true wisdom, who has brought me nigh to God, and opened for me the path to immortality, if he shall not be admired, and loved, and hailed with raptures of joy. This is no fanatical nor superstitious emotion, but it is the natural, the true and sober homage of human feeling to transcendent worth and loveliness of character, and to unspeakable goodness—goodness not common and earthly, but spiritual, disinterested, divine; witnessed by toils and sufferings, and sealed in death."—P. 24.

---

ART. VIII.—*A Discourse on Regeneration.* By Bernard Whitman, of Waltham. 2nd Edit. Boston, Bowles and Dearborn, 1828.

THIS is an intelligent, practical, and rational discourse, on the change which the Christian religion is designed to produce in the minds of men. The preacher *first* notices some of the conversions which took place under the preaching of the inspired apostles; *secondly*, describes the nature of regeneration as consisting in a change from ignorance to Christian knowledge, from error to Christian truth, and from sin to holiness. The necessity of regeneration arises from these three causes; the imperfection of our nature, the imperfection of our education, and our invincible desire for happiness. He, *thirdly*, examines the spiritual condition of those born and educated in Christian lands; and *fourthly*, answers the questions, "What are the evidences of our regeneration? What are the scriptural proofs that we are real Christians?"

## OCCASIONAL CORRESPONDENCE.

*The Popular View of the Atonement renounced, and the Sufferings of Christ considered.*

To the Editor.

SIR,

Chard, Aug. 9th.

WHILE I would not forget that my respectful acknowledgments are due to your correspondents T. F. B. and G. A. for their attentive consideration of my questions on the Atonement, I beg to state, so far as the querist *himself* is concerned, that had they remained *unanswered*, they would not weigh a feather against the conclusions to which his mind is at present arrived on the subject. When I sent those questions to the Repository, it was in the early and imperfect stage of my inquiries; and when the absurdities connected with the orthodox opinion had not pressed with that convincing force on my mind which, by a further consideration thereof, they subsequently have. I am now fully convinced that this doctrine will not stand the test of examination by the rules of reason and the authority of Scripture: that it is altogether incompatible with that dispensation of mercy and forgiveness which Jesus came to unfold and administer on behalf of his Father, the only true God; and therefore I renounce it as an *ERROR*, which has for a long time proved to me a source of perplexity and difficulty, and an obstacle to my real religious improvement. Under this conviction, I have been led to review the queries which I had thought involved such difficulties on the side of Unitarianism, and have discovered that they were in good part founded in erroneous data and unwarrantable assumption. Without wishing to express the least dissatisfaction with the replies of your correspondents, therefore, I trust a few additional observations, as coming from the pen of the proposer of these queries, though they might be of no weight in themselves, will serve to shew that he is not discarding long-received opinions without earnest inquiry and reflection.

The question to which my remarks will be confined is the *second*, which is on the nature and end of Christ's sufferings. This question turns entirely on

the position, which I believe is taken for granted by all parties, that these sufferings were *UNPARALLELED* in the case of any other human being. Hence, preachers and writers, in describing them, have laid the utmost stress on their supposed exceeding magnitude, and exhausted the powers of language on their imagined extent and intensity. Such, however, is the obstinate effect of systems on the mind, that *this*, as a fact appertaining to revelation, is commonly considered as beyond all dispute; and till very lately I had thought so too: but now I clearly perceive it is a notion which has grown out of the doctrine of satisfaction for sin, and which, indeed, is absolutely necessary to be established, in order to prove that satisfaction a *reality*. On this subject, as well as on that of the Trinity and others, the orthodox have betrayed their obtrusive meddling in the employment of terms and phrases altogether unscriptural and perverting; and in their efforts to attach the most tragic character to what Jesus endured, as held to be vicarious, they have exaggerated the accounts of the sacred historians by language adapted, it is true, to *their* creed, but much stronger in meaning than is justified by the expressions of the New Testament. Hence, amongst other assertions of the kind, it is not unfrequently affirmed, as sterling truth, that the fiercest wrath and indignation of Jehovah the Father was poured on the *Son* as the desert of imputed sin! \* the feeling of which, together with what is called the assaults of hell, or the infernal attacks of Satan, constituted the most dreadful suffering. Now, if the New-Testament writers held this view of the subject, it is very strange they did not, when speaking of the sufferings of their beloved Master, use terms and phrases more forcible and expressive in their import, as they certainly *might* have done; or that they should not have evinced, by ardent exclamations, those sympathetic emotions

\* I have more than once heard it affirmed in the pulpit, that Jesus suffered "more than the damned in hell will to all eternity!"

of soul which would be naturally excited by the remembrance and record of such unexampled pains and sorrows.

That the New-Testament writers frequently refer to the sufferings of Jesus, both as connected with salvation and by way of encouragement to his suffering followers, in bearing patiently *their* tribulations, is not questioned; but the instances in which the *nature and extent* of those sufferings are *described*, are very few. The following are the principal: Matt. xxvi. 38, 39; Luke xxii. 44; John xii. 27; Heb. v. 7. The strongest of these are the first two: the one represents his soul as exceeding sorrowful, and the other as being in such agony as produced an extraordinary degree of sweat, inasmuch as the Evangelist describes the drops thereof as resembling in magnitude (and perhaps in turbidity) great drops of blood. He does *not* say, as many do *for* him, that Jesus sweat *blood*, but that "his sweat was, *as it were*, or more properly *like* \* (*ὡς αἷμα*) drops of blood"—language which certainly intimates great mental commotion and anguish. But will it be said that these expressions convey an idea of the deepest possible pangs of horror? Has there not occurred, and does there not occur many a case amongst the sons of misery and woe—the subjects of sorrow, affliction, and despair, to which expressions conveying the ideas of extreme agony and sorrowfulness of soul are applicable? I will refer to two only, which, if plaintive utterings are to govern our ideas of difference and degrees of suffering, *exceed* that of our Lord himself; namely, Job and David. The former, after employing the strongest figures to express his misery and heart-troubles, complains of the *inadequacy* of language to convey a true idea of them. See Job vi. 1—4, also chap. lli. The marginal reading opposite the 2nd verse in the former chapter is, "I want words to express my grief." But have the writers of the New Testament intimated any such insufficiency of speech in recording the sorrows and anguish of Jesus?

With respect to the case of David, the following Psalms may be consulted: vi., xxii., lxi., lxxxviii., cii. From these I will quote a few passages: "I am poured out like water; my heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels. My strength is dried up like a

potsherd, and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws. Thy wrath lieth hard upon me, and thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves. While I suffer thy terrors, I am distracted; thy fierce wrath goeth over me, and thy terrors have cut me off. For my days are consumed like smoke, and my bones are burned as an hearth; my heart is smitten and withered like grass. By reason of the voice of my groaning my bones cleave to my skin."

That the above language is partly hyperbolic I admit; but at the same time as the speaker is considered to be inspired, it must be *figuratively true*; for metaphors are generally employed in scripture for want of literal terms sufficiently strong in their meaning. I am very well aware also, that these and all such like expressions have been pressed into the service of orthodoxy, under the notion that David was a type of Christ. But there are two considerations against that application in this way. The first is, the New-Testament writers have not adopted such a course; while, if they had thought as modern Christians do, I see not any reason why they should not. The second is, that as David ascribes his sufferings principally to the *wrath of the Almighty*, there is a great disparity in the two cases: for we are nowhere told in the New Testament that Jesus was an object of Divine wrath; but, on the contrary, we have abundant proof that he was peculiarly privileged with the enjoyment of his Father's favour and complacency. The commencement of his public ministry was even ushered in with a proclamation to this effect. "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," is certainly an opposite declaration to such as, "This is the sinner's substitute, with whom, as charged with the sin of others, I am exceedingly wroth, and whom I will make to feel my fierce anger in the vicarious punishment thereof." The latter is the sentiment of what is called *orthodoxy*; the former the assertion of Jehovah. Which is the truth?

As to the bodily sufferings of Christ, on which so much stress is generally laid, we have no account of it which *equals* those given us of many martyrs who have been persecuted unto death. The death of the cross was the common punishment of malefactors, convicted as such, and, it is true, an ignominious one; but have not the persecutors of his disciples resorted to modes of torture and excruciating pain more terrible than this? Can it be compared to

\* Parkhurst on the word.



burning? Jesus was indeed treated by his enemies with every species of reproach and scorn; and so, according to his predictions, were his followers. Attend to the account of Paul in 2 Cor. xi. 23—28. Here are enumerated many different species of malevolent punishment, from which, as far as narrative particulars direct us, Jesus was exempt. It is true, that he was smitten with a rod, and scourged; but Paul experienced the former violence *thrice*, and the latter infliction, according to the Jewish law, *five* times; and let me ask in connexion with these statements, why, if the sufferings of Jesus were penal and vicarious, was Paul called to endure in his *own person* what is supposed to be borne by his *substitute*? Does justice require double payment? Or, in the language of an orthodox hymn, does it demand satisfaction “first from the bleeding *surety's* hand, and then again of *mine*”?

Far be it from me to *underrate* the sufferings of the great Leader of our salvation—the great Example of humility, submission, and patience, to his believing followers; or to deny that they have an important connexion with the grand concerns of redemption. The fact is, when the sacred writers, speaking of our spiritual deliverance, refer to Jesus as the Mediator, they attach all the consequence as a means thereof—not to his previous sufferings by far so much as they do to his death; therefore, if there is any thing vicarious in what he endured, it must be the *latter*. But if the penalty of sin is eternal damnation, how could the sacrifice of natural life, though ever so painful, be an equivalent to Divine justice, seeing there is no sort of parity or analogy between the penalty and the payment? Besides, as death put a termination to the sufferings of Jesus, so far from receiving a satisfaction therefrom, justice must be thereby completely defeated and deprived of its just requisition, inasmuch as the real penalty would be obviated or averted. The death of the Son of God was no doubt satisfactory, that is, *approved* as a medium through which to manifest his mercy; but this is not the idea generally attached to the word. By satisfaction is understood an equal return of good for injury done; a restoration of rights deprived. Regarding sin as a debt, it is the payment of an adequate and full amount in suffering, which is the just desert of that sin. There cannot, then, be any sort of comparison between bodily death and a punishment

of endless duration, which necessarily implies the *indestructible* nature of the sufferer as adapted to such suffering. Whatever, therefore, was the degree of suffering which Jesus endured, its *duration* was, compared with the penalty, of very little account. But, further, if the *death* of Christ is to be viewed as an equivalent to justice, why are all mankind inevitably subject to death? And if *death* could be a satisfaction, why could not the sinner's death be so? Not only so, the death of *one* person, according to this notion, is equivalent to that of *numberless* individuals of the human race! The hackneyed expedient of throwing his supposed divinity into the scale, is too absurd to be regarded as an argument. Whatever are the benefits the New-Testament writers ascribe to his death, they always speak of that death as pertaining to the identical being who *really suffered it*, and not to an imaginary superior being united with him. It was impossible Deity could die, and therefore it could not be the *death* of the Deity. This notion is altogether inconsistent with the nature of substitution: for a substitute is one who acts, performs, or bears, in the place of another, what that other must otherwise have acted, performed, or borne. In order to this, therefore, it is absolutely necessary that he who substitutes should be *capable* of doing what is required by *natural fitness*. This is the only idea of substitution suggested by the term in the common concerns of life. If, therefore, Deity is *incapable* of suffering and dying, it could, in no sense, be *substitute* for man. Again, since there is such an immense disproportion between Deity and humanity, the dignity and worth which is supposed to be added to the acts of the latter by the former, would give as much weight to a *moment's* suffering, as to thirty, nay, a *thousand* years'; because the *greatest* degree of what is finite bears no more proportion with infinitude than the *smallest*; consequently, the greater part of Christ's sufferings were unnecessary and superfluous, seeing the least portion thereof, in point of equivalency, would have answered the same purpose. It is, however, repugnant to the wisdom of God, to suppose that in his plans and proceedings, he suffers any thing—much less a considerable *evil*—to occur unnecessarily.

R. M.

## King's College, London.

To the Editor.

"King's College, London. At a meeting of the friends and subscribers of this Institution, held Thursday, 17th July, 1828,

"Resolved,

"That an essential part of public education is instruction in the Evidences of the Christian Religion, and the inculcation of those Doctrines and Duties which are professed and taught by the Established Church."

Then follows a list of gentlemen requested to assist the Committee for promoting subscriptions in the city, including the name, Thomas Alers Hankey, Esq.

SIR,

This advertisement, of which I send an extract, appeared lately in the London newspapers. Allow me to ask, whether the above-named gentleman is not a "Deputy," and even a member of the Committee; if he be, whether (supposing that his opinions really coincide with the advertisement) he is a fit person so to remain, however suited he may be to recommend the doctrines and duties professed by the Established Church as essential to education.

Allow me to ask a question also about the London University. I have lately seen the form for application for admission as a student, and in one column the applicant is required to state whether he is "a Churchman or Dissenter." Is it that the proprietors of "THE University Chapel" may know whether he is a customer for them or not? What if the applicant be neither Churchman nor Dissenter?

Really, whatever may be the intentions of the managers of this Institution, they seem to me to have been of late travelling the high road to make themselves very meddling and very ridiculous. What right have they to be asking what the religious opinions of the students are, or to set up distinctions and create party divisions by classifying in this way? The plan of King's College is much more sensible and less impertinent than this conduct in an institution whose principal recommendation *was* its abstinence from *all* religious distinctions.

A NON CON.

## On Forms of Marriage.

To the Editor.

SIR, Clapton, July 25, 1828.

MY friend Mr. Richmond's remarks (p. 502) on "the Marriage Bill," from the enactment of which Unitarians may expect some relief, in a future session of Parliament, reminded me of two passages which strikingly discover the application of justice and good sense to this important subject.

The first passage may serve to shew the practice, half a century ago, of a neighbouring foreign state, which, whatever may be its condition under a monarchy, was then free, probably beyond any other country in Europe, from the baneful influence of priest craft.

The Rev. James Granger, so well and deservedly known by his "Biographical History of England," was travelling through Holland in 1774, in the company of Lord Mountstuart. Among the "Notes of Tours," published in 1805, from the autograph MS. of that respectable clergyman, is the following description (p. 32) of marriages, according to what, I suppose, were then the only legal forms recognized by the government of the United Provinces.

"July 30, we reached Amsterdam, and on Sunday, 31, we, by the favour of the Baron B——, brother of Mr. Trevor Hampden, saw fifteen couple married. The men and women were at first in separate apartments in the Stadt-house. We there saw the latter, whom the men, after a little time, came into the rooms to, and led into the large room, where they were married, sitting, by a counsellor at law, to whom was joined an assessor of the same profession. The Baron B——, who is a Secretary of State, was also present, besides other persons who attended *ex officio*. The persons who were married joined hands, and each couple was asked, in very few words, the important question. After they had given their assent, which was noted in a book by the counsellor who performed the office, the populace, of whom great numbers attended at the door, were admitted as witnesses, and the several couples went out, hand in hand."

The other passage to which I referred, contains the project of a law of marriage, which, unless the justice of peace were directed or empowered to exact an oath or some declaration of religious belief, appears to provide for the cases of all persons who scrupled conformity, on



whatever ground, to established rites. This project was first brought before the public in 1793, by the late learned and venerable Baron Maseres, in a letter to "the Public Advertiser, on Mr. Courtenay's intended motion, concerning the process of ecclesiastical courts against persons married together in some manner not allowed by law." I here quote from the Baron's "Occasional Essays on various Subjects, chiefly Political and Historical," which he collected and published, in 1809.

He contends (p. 252), that "as the law now stands, there is no other mode of marrying, besides that prescribed by the Church of England, that is clearly and indisputably legal." Though "the marriages of Jews and Quakers are spoken of in Lord Hardwick's Marriage-Act, passed in 1752, as if they were legal," he says,

"If a Quaker was to die intestate, and in possession of a landed estate of inheritance, and his wife was to claim her dower of one-third part of his said landed estate, during her life; and the intestate's next heir was to dispute her claim to such dower, on the ground of her not having been lawfully married, I do not see how she could ever establish her marriage; as a certificate from the bishop of the diocese, the only known way of proving a marriage in such an action for dower, would not be granted to the Quaker's wife."

Justly assuming, "that all persons who are permitted to live in England, ought to be permitted to marry there;" and "that, according to the principles of the Protestant religion, marriage is not a sacrament, but a civil contract," the learned Baron deems it "reasonable that an Act of Parliament should be passed" for the following purposes:

"1. To make all the marriages celebrated in the meeting-houses, or chapels, of Protestant Dissenters (duly licensed according to the Toleration Act) lawful.

"2. To declare all marriages celebrated by Quakers in their meeting-houses, and by Jews in their synagogues, to be also lawful.

"3. To declare that all marriages that shall be entered into before the justices of the peace of any county, at their quarter-sessions, or other general sessions, and, perhaps, even before any two justices of the peace, shall also be lawful."

In the former Series of the Repository (XIV. 358) I quoted at length, "An Act touching Marriages, Births, and Burials," passed by the Parliament of 1653.

I there remarked how the principle of this Act had been recognized in the *Code Napoleon*, (Nos. 75, 165,) whose provisions, on the return of the *legitimates*, were adopted by the *Code Royale*. It is not surprising that a Bourbon, influenced by his priests, should since have endeavoured to deprive France of the benefits to be derived from such wise and equitable regulations, and to restore the influence of an established clergy, by rendering the imposing ceremonies of the church essential to the legality of marriage. Perhaps some of your readers can say how far the *Grand Monarque* may have succeeded in the attempt.

J. T. RUTT.

### *Sermons for Family Use.*

*To the Editor.*

*Hapton, near Norwich,*

SIR, *July 11, 1828.*

COINCIDING generally in sentiment with your correspondent M. N. T., respecting Robert Robinson's *Barn Sermons*, and the very useful object to which they may be accommodated, I beg to say to that gentleman, that should his suggestion be favourably received, I am disposed to engage in the task, and that I shall be happy to hear from him on the subject.

While the pen is in my hand, I gladly embrace the opportunity of recording the obligations of the Christian public to the Rev. B. Mardon, for again calling their attention to an "Essay on the Use and Design of Scripture Sacrifices, in which the Theory of Archbishop Magee (possibly that also of the learned Dr. Pye Smith) is controverted by the late Rev. James Nicol." In importance, this subject seems to yield to none of those which are most worthy of human investigation; and the extracts from the work, which are given in your last number, furnish ample proof, that the mind of the learned author was richly imbued with the very spirit which must render the discussion improving, as well as interesting.

With every good wish for the increasing success of your valuable publication, I am, &c.,

JOHN TREMLETT.

### *Bible Controversy in Ireland.*

*To the Editor.*

SIR,

THE title of a very liberal and excellent publication, reviewed in the Repo-



sitory for August, "on the Bible Controversy in Ireland," "Infallibility not possible, Error not culpable;" has suggested the following extracts from two of the greatest patrons of religious freedom that ever wrote:

"If I be desirous to know the truth, and diligent in seeking it, and yet through human infirmity fall into error, THAT ERROR CANNOT BE DAMNABLE."—CHILLINGWORTH.

"He that makes use of the light and faculties God has given him, and seeks sincerely to discover truth by those helps and abilities he has, may have this satisfaction in doing his duty as a rational creature, that though he should miss truth, HE WILL NOT MISS THE REWARD OF IT."—LOCKE.

Let me by way of contrast to those noble principles annex the following extracts:

"The misunderstanding of God's word on the fundamental truths of the Christian system, cannot afford any security to error, but will expose it to the WRATH OF THE GREAT ETERNAL."

"I believe that the man who holds not the divinity of Christ, is in fatal error; I believe that if he continue under its influence, he will PERISH."—MR. POPE: *Discussion*.

"He therefore that will be saved, must thus think," &c.—ATHANASIAN CREED.

REV.

### *The Deputies.*

*To the Editor.*

SIR,

August 5, 1828.

THE letter relating to the Deputies, inserted in this month's Repository, signed A Dissenter, contains so much matter, and, as it appears to me, requiring explanation, that I do hope a sense of justice, and what is due to the cause of liberty, will induce you to insert the following observations. The general outline of the constitution (or rather the want of a constitution) of the society of Deputies appears correct, and the inutility the "Dissenter" ascribes to the society seems to be equally true. The essential difference I have with the "Dissenter," arises from his seeming to suppose that

the correction of abuses and of persecution rested with the society of Deputies, while it is notorious that the Protestant Society, formed for the purpose of overthrowing Lord Sidmouth's Bill, (which its force in a peculiar manner so happily effected) has been the Society chiefly engaged in redressing the wrongs inflicted upon conscientious Dissenters, and that where the Deputies have had one case of this description submitted to them, the Protestant Society have had twenty; indeed, I believe, such was the apathy of the Society of Deputies, that only one case of real persecution has been submitted to them in a course of twelve months, not arising from persecution being dormant, but from the Protestant Society pursuing more direct means of redress; and as to the amount of funds, the Deputies have had more than sufficient for the real duties they have discharged. With respect to the removal of the Corporation and Test Acts, and substituting a less objectionable test and oath, neither the spirited agency, nor the funds of the Deputies effected that: the object, such as it is, has been attained by a union and deputation from five societies, who were all to contribute to the expense; but in consideration of three of the bodies not being equal to such a contribution, the Protestant Society agreed to bear one-third, and the Deputies two-thirds; and as the whole expense is estimated at three thousand pounds, the Protestant Society will pay one thousand, the Deputies two thousand, (and upon the implied condition that no collection was to be made by the congregations of Dissenters to supply the deficiency,)—the Deputies will be left with near seven thousand, and the Protestant Society with three. Any renovation or stimulus to the general objects of both Societies I shall rejoice in promoting. I am free from any sectarian feeling; liberty, the right of believing or disbelieving, is what to us, as *men* and as Christians, should be the object of pursuit—unconnected with religious qualifications of any description—civil qualifications being the alone test for civil offices.

*A Berean, and therefore in principle  
a Friend to Liberty.*

## OBITUARY.

---

MRS. RICHARD YATES.

1828. July 21, Mrs. RICHARD YATES, of *Torteth Park*, near *Liverpool*, aged 35, much esteemed and beloved. "It is painful," said Mr. Porter, the Minister of *Toxteth-Park Chapel*, in an affecting funeral address, "it is painful, under any circumstances, to witness the ravages of the great Destroyer. It is painful, under any circumstances, to behold a fellow-creature, from the full enjoyment of his noblest faculties, hurled to the earth as an useless trunk, and in one short hour deprived of life, sense, and motion. But it becomes doubly painful and distressing when we behold the ghastly king seizing for his prey the young, the beautiful, and the virtuous, persons whom many loved and none hated, separating them from husbands, parents, friends, all by whom they were beloved, and whom they loved also. In such a case as this, nothing can support the mind but a firm confidence in Heaven, and a calm resignation to its irresistible decrees.

"The melancholy event which has this morning summoned us together, is of that kind which I have here described. The strong hand of death hath parted asunder hearts that were united together by the tenderest ties of conjugal affection. It hath deprived parents of the stay and solace of their old age; of the 'light of their eyes'—a jewel that the wealth of worlds could not have purchased; and it hath spread a mournful gloom over a wide circle of relatives and friends.

"Over the lifeless tenant of that bier, death reigns in awful majesty. 'The silver chord is loosed, the golden bowl is broken.' Nought now remains of what once was beauty, and innocence, and truth, but these clay-cold ashes.

"Oh! what heart could endure this loss, what tongue could pronounce the long farewell to one so good, so gentle, and so kind, did not religion infuse some drops of sweetness into the cup of woe?

"To stand beside the grave of one we loved and see its portals closed, not knowing whether any sun would ever again illumine its darksome chambers, would be almost sufficient to drive man to distraction, to make him doubt the goodness of his Maker, and curse the

hour in which he came into the world. But, blessed be God! we are not thus left comfortless. We are not left to doubt or uncertainty on this momentous subject. *We* are forbidden to sorrow as those who have no hope.

"Revelation assures us, that these *corruptible* bodies which we commit to the earth, shall be raised up again *incorruptible*, by the mighty power of God, when that period shall have arrived, which, in the course of his providence, he hath appointed. Scripture cries aloud to man *not to be afraid*. The heavens shall pass away, and the earth also; but we have the assurance of one whose word shall not pass away, that after having slept the sleep appointed unto all, we shall be raised again. 'Blessed, therefore, yea, thrice blessed, are the dead who die in the Lord, for they rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.'

SAMUEL HAUGHTON, ESQ.

*London, August 15, 1828.*

SIR,

THE following appropriate sketch of a truly valuable character, (brother-in-law to the late Mr. John Hancock, of *Lisburn*, whose obituary was inserted in the First Series of the *Mon. Repos.* for November, 1823, XVIII. 668,) is transcribed from the *Carlow Morning Post*, and I hope you will record it in your journal, though its insertion has been so long delayed.

THOMAS FOSTER.

Lately, in the 80th year of his age, SAMUEL HAUGHTON, Esq., a man long known and respected in this town for sterling worth. Indeed, his was no common character. At a period of life when success rarely inspires moderation in the pursuit of fortune, Mr. Haughton remembered the great law of his Christian profession, that *no man liveth to himself*. He looked around for occasions of disinterested exertion, and he found them. In his ideas of benevolence he seemed to feel that

"To every want, and every woe,  
To guilt itself, when in distress,"

the balm of sympathy should be imparted; and to hundreds, yes, to thousands, of

his less fortunate fellow-creatures, his purse and his heart were ever open.

"He had no party rage, no sectary's whim."

He was a firm believer in the wisdom and justice of God, in the truth and importance of the divine mission of Christ; a Christian according to the pure maxims of the gospel, equally free from bigotry and spiritual pride.

His religious principles were liberal, in the best sense of the word; allowing to others the full exercise of their reason and conscience, he regarded the virtuous of every denomination as equally acceptable in the sight of God. He drew consolation in his sufferings from the prospect of a future life, and placing his trust in the goodness of Providence, he bore them with patience, fortitude, and resignation. During his long illness, he seemed constantly and deeply impressed with the greatness and condescension of the Creator, and the unworthiness of the creature; but "Happy is he that hath

the God of Israel for his help, whose hope is in the Lord his God."

To the last he enjoyed the society of his friends, for

"While the serious thought his soul approved,  
Cheerful he seemed, and gentleness he loved."

He died surrounded by his mourning family, and has left them a proud inheritance—the memory of a parent of unblemished integrity and honour. His trials are over, his character is sealed, and when time has a little healed the wounds of so recent an affliction, they must feel that they have no cause to mourn that he has changed his state of existence.

"Oh! sacred sorrow, by whom souls are tried,  
Sent not to punish mortals but to guide,"

lend thy ameliorating influence to teach the afflicted heart where alone to look for true consolation.

## INTELLIGENCE.

### *Anniversary of South Wales Unitarian Society.*

THE Annual Meeting of the South Wales Unitarian Society was held at Swansea, on Wednesday, the 9th of July; and, for the number and respectability of the attendants, the excellence of the religious services, and the mutual pleasure and encouragement derived from it, was considered the best meeting which has been had since the institution of the Society twenty years ago—manifesting a great increase of Unitarian intelligence and zeal in South Wales. Large and attentive audiences were highly edified and gratified by the morning and evening services. In the morning, the Rev. Dr. Rees, of Stamford Street, London, offered the prayers; the Rev. John James, of Gellionen, preached the Welsh sermon; and the Rev. R. Aspland, of Hackney, the English. In the evening, the Rev. Wm. Bowen, of Coventry, prayed; and the Rev. P. Davison, of Jewin Street, London, preached. Mr. Aspland's sermon, on 1 Cor. iv. 13, "Being defamed, we entreat," was considered to be a very

seasonable and useful explanation of Unitarianism and defence of Unitarians, and he was requested to print it. To this request he kindly assented; and the Rev. D. Jones, of Carmarthen, has engaged to translate and publish it in the Welsh language.

At dinner, and after dinner, upwards of a hundred members and their friends spent a few hours together in rational conviviality and improving and animating conversation. Mr. Aspland contributed greatly to the spirit of the meeting, as Chairman; and he and several other gentlemen delivered speeches which afforded great satisfaction and pleasure by their allusions to the growing liberality of the age, and to several public and local circumstances, encouraging to the friends of truth, liberty, and improvement.

### *Sussex Unitarian Association.*

THE Ninth Annual Meeting of the Sussex Unitarian Association was held at Lewes, on Wednesday, August 13, 1828, when the Rev. E. Tagart delivered



an excellent discourse to an attentive and respectable audience, from 1 Cor. iv. 13, "Being defamed, we entreat." At the close of the service, the Report of the Committee for the past year was read and adopted. Among other topics, it recommended the Association to open, if possible, a place of worship in some adjacent town or village, and continue a regular supply of ministers from the neighbouring congregations. This suggestion met with the approval of the Meeting, and it was resolved that an attempt should be made at Scarms Hill, a village about ten miles from Lewes, as soon as the necessary arrangements could be completed.

The members and friends of the Association afterwards dined together at the Crown Inn; J. Boys, Esq., of Brighton, in the Chair. Dr. Morell, the Revs. E. Tagart, J. C. Wallace, C. P. Valentine, R. Ashdowne, and G. Duplock, together with Messrs. Ashdowne, Fisher, Holtham, Stevens, and Browne, severally addressed the Meeting, which was also honoured by the company of James Young, Esq., of Hackney, whose animated and eloquent remarks on the subject of civil and religious liberty, called forth the repeated applause of those assembled. The afternoon was spent in a most agreeable manner, and the company separated at an early hour, highly gratified with the proceedings of the day.

The next tea meeting of the Association was appointed to be held at Ditchling, on Wednesday, September 24th. Rev. C. P. Valentine was requested to preach.

#### *Hampstead Chapel.*

THE Unitarian Chapel at Hampstead, which has recently been rebuilt, was opened for divine worship on Sunday, August 3. The Rev. John Kenrick preached on the occasion, from John iv. 23. His discourse produced a deep impression on all present, and will not soon be forgotten, even if he should not comply with a general and earnest request for its publication. The congregation were gratified by the attendance of many friends of religious truth, and the services of the day gave much encouragement for the future.

#### *Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association.*

THE next Half-yearly Meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 24th, at Bridgewater. The sermon of the morning will be delivered by the Rev. T. W.

Horsfield, of Taunton, and it is expected that there will be an evening service also.

E. WHITFIELD.

*Ilminster, August 7, 1828.*

#### CALCUTTA.

*Extract from Mr. Adam's Letter of 5th February, 1828, to the Foreign Secretary of the Unitarian Association.*

"DURING the last month I have written to Dr. Tuckerman, Secretary to the American Unitarian Society for promoting Christianity in India, respecting a coadjutor in my Missionary labours, and I beg the favour of your communicating with him on this subject, and ascertaining his views and those of his friends in Boston relating to it. A salary of one hundred and fifty rupees per month is attached to the head teachership of Ram-mohun Roy's Anglo-Hindoo School, and he authorizes me to say that he holds it open for the acceptance of any Missionary who may be sent to Calcutta, and who may be competent and willing to aid me occasionally in English preaching, and in general Missionary duties. If he is a single man, he could live (and he could do no more than live with any tolerable degree of comfort and respectability) on three hundred rupees per month, and by this offer, therefore, you have one half of his salary already provided for. May I not hope that exertions will be made to obtain the remaining half, and that some one will be found to 'come over and help us'?"

#### IRELAND.

##### SYNOD OF ULSTER.

#### *Important Discussion on the Subject of Trinitarianism.*

(Continued from p. 584.)

MR. CAMPBELL (Templepatrick) objected to tests, and argued for the use of reason in religious matters.

MR. ELDER said, he had been forty-eight years a member of that Synod, and he was astonished to find that not less than thirty-two ministers and eighteen elders had denied the doctrine of the Trinity. Mr. Porter, he said, was an amiable man, but he could hold no ministerial communion with him. Mr. Montgomery was a learned man, but it was a ground of lamentation that such eminent talents should not be employed in displaying the glories of the adorable Trinity. The resolutions, he contended,

were imperfect, unless the Arians were excluded. The deity of Jesus Christ was so clearly pointed out in Scripture, that it was astonishing any man should deny it. He was unwilling to say it, but an Arian could not be a Christian, and he could not have saving faith.

Mr. JOHN BROWN said—I approach this subject with feelings of awe, like one dreading the explosion of a mine, because I feel a strong attachment to the Synod of Ulster. Though very unhappy when contemplating the agitations of this body, my hope and prayer is, that the great Head of the Church will overrule them to promote our best interests. I prefer the amended to the original overtures; because, though both tend to secure the same object, the former do so in a more open and candid manner;—the latter appear to me like a masked battery, but the former plainly specify Arianism to be the disease to which we are to apply a remedy, and in attacking this system I wish no disguise. Though I have no intention to follow the example of some who boast of their study and acquirements, and though I am free to admit that I am but a child in knowledge, if compared with Mr. Carlile, yet the views of that gentleman, whom I love and venerate, appear to me so visionary on the subject of ministerial communion that I must protest against them. When Christ prayed that his followers should be of one mind, he appears to me to have established the necessity of unity in sentiment and feeling among them; and, in point of fact, how is it possible for persons to walk or act in harmony who are not agreed on the essential truths of Christianity—the dignity of Zion's King, and the influence of his atonement? I maintain, moreover, that facts established by our experience have proved the evil of disagreement in doctrine. This church moved forward gloriously, disseminating pure religion, until Arianism was engrafted upon it, when it became stationary and paralyzed; and its late movements have all been made under an orthodox banner. What facts so clearly demonstrated, might have been expected from the nature of the case. Any farmer would see that a three-horse plough could never serve his purposes if two horses were opposed to one. The two might drag the one with them by superior strength, but the constant struggle would arrest the labours of the ploughman. And so I maintain that discord in this body, wherein Arianism has antagonized orthodoxy, has of late produced a violent struggle; or, if struggling

has been avoided, it has been by complete inactivity. The foxes caught by Samson, and bound with firebrands to their tails, spreading desolation and ruin, I consider an apt emblem of orthodox and heretical men spreading the flames of discord and distrust by their struggles in the Lord's vineyard. Much has been said against creeds; but, whilst I admit that they have been abused, I am prepared to meet the reproach that will be poured upon me, and to avow myself the pupil and advocate of a Presbytery, which, by its creed, has prevented the disease which these overtures are intended to remedy. The venomous reptiles represented by tradition as flying from St. Patrick, are an emblem of Arian principles, which the Route Presbytery has put to flight by its creed, so that not one member of that numerous body is infected with Arianism. I do not wish to be misunderstood as an advocate of intolerance, or as laying snares for men's consciences. I do not wish an uniformity like that of the grave, where there prevails the stillness of death; nor like that of the galley-ship, where none dare express his real feelings. But, while I rejoice in the freedom afforded by the *Pacific Act*, I am opposed to a Latitudinarian faith. The compilers of our standards stood on high vantage ground, as they wrote or compiled their creed at a later period than other Reformed churches, and availed themselves of their labours; and certainly this church, in the days of her glory, maintained an uniform creed. It has been asserted, that the adoption of a test infringes on the right of private judgment. Now, this right I deem invaluable, and disclaim all interference with it. I assert, however, that many of its clamorous advocates mistake its nature, and wish to trench on the privileges of others. I think it too evident to require proof, that every voluntary association, like this body, has a right to frame laws for its government and preservation, and no man is injured whom its laws exclude. Surely, then, the charge of arrogance recoils on the heads of those men, however elevated in the world, who have ventured to prescribe the course to be pursued by this body, though its members are responsible to the tribunal of heaven. God's word is plain, as it is unerring; and it says, "Come out from among them"—"bid them not God speed who bring another gospel." References have been made to former periods of our history, when our ancestors differed, but maintained unity. The cases are not parallel—they were



agreed about the Head of the church. I see no advantage from our present unnatural association. If Arians are right in their views, I am an idolater. If I am right, they worship another God than the God of revelation. The few Arians that exist in this Synod, press upon it like an incubus, binding down its energies, and disturbing its peace. St. Paul speaks of a *body of death*, from which he panted for deliverance; and not more ardent was his desire of deliverance from sin than is Presbyterian Ulster to be freed from this evil affixed to pride by the enemy of souls. I am disposed to exchange the courtesies of life with Arians, and to display to their persons every feeling of benevolence; but I love my Saviour too much to wish religious intercourse with those who would rob him of his glory. I have avoided debating the principle of Arianism, for I trust that this body will never submit to the degradation of entertaining such a question. If, however, Christ bear the name Jehovah, with all the worship and attributes and honours annexed to that name, how can I refuse to believe that he was God manifest in the flesh? Besides, if he be not God, I must discredit his mission, and pronounce his religion false. He came to destroy idolatry, and yet ninety-nine out of a hundred of his followers, in all ages, have believed in his Deity; and so, on this hypothesis, have frustrated his labours. Moreover, he was charged with blasphemy, when representing himself as equal with God. Had he not been God he would have repelled the charge; and, therefore, his admission of it seems to me clear proof of his Deity. Never, in my experience, have I met a dying creature that had peace if ignorant of the atonement of Christ. Without deciding whether or not we should exclude the few infected with this disease that are among us, (for this question is not before us,) I trust that we shall shut the door against all such in future; and, therefore I shall vote for the amended overtures.

Mr. MACULLOCH (Newtownards) took a historical view of the state of Christianity, and the influence of Arianism in paralyzing its vitality through successive periods. Among other things he said, that it lays the foundation of infidelity, and a total rejection of revelation, by bringing the "Son of God below absolute Deity to be the son of a mother," "such as I am." The Arian gradually stretches his mind beyond his system into Deism, and, by a natural progress, he settles down into point blank Atheism. He argued

for a direct separation. It had been alleged, Let the Synod alone, and it will mend. But he would say in the words of Peter Pindar, in relation to Mr. Pitt,

"Some say he'll mend. What? Mend a mummer?  
He'll mend just like sour ale in summer."—(A laugh.)

It has been said that the orthodox had in this contest been the aggressors—the reverse was the case. The Unitarian Societies of England had been supplying the North of Ireland with their publications. The sermons of Price and Channing had been reprinted and widely circulated, and if any thing at all would make men Arians, these works would do it. A very clever man, a divine from this county, said he, once wanted to give my son some Unitarian tracts. I would not let him. He then wanted him to his house to converse with him. I would not permit that either. I knew the danger; for, God forgive me, I believe I was once a little contaminated myself. Yet, (said Mr. M'C.,) I hope we shall all meet in heaven. (A laugh.)

Dr. WRIGHT opposed *in toto* the doctrine of separation, because by persecution no good had ever been effected, and he was persuaded never would. He was himself conscientiously attached to Calvinistic principles, but he was no party man—he had stood aloof from all parties, and he would most cordially vote for the original overture.

Saturday, June 28th.

Synod met at eight o'clock, A. M. The consideration of the Overture and Amendment being resumed,

Mr. BARNETT (of Moneymore) said, he would oppose the whole of these resolutions, though he approved of some of them abstractedly, because he regarded them as insufficient instruments to accomplish a particular purpose. They were but insidious modes of doing what should be done openly, honestly, and avowedly. They were intended to get rid of certain members of the Synod—but would the proposed reformation of morals have been touched, had not the other been contemplated? Again, he would oppose them, because they could not be adopted without overlooking several injunctions of the book of God. Mr. B. referred to Gal. i. 7, in which the introduction of "another gospel" is noticed—and what course did the Apostle recommend? "I would they were even cut off that trouble you," though their error consisted in merely making

some Jewish ceremonies part of the grounds of their acceptance with God. "A man who is a heretic, after the first and second admonition," the church is enjoined to "reject." We are required to "mark those who cause divisions, and to avoid them." As an associated body, united to the same Redeemer, it is our duty to be joined together in unfeigned love and affection—knit together in the faith of the gospel; but though for his Arian brethren he might cherish a love of benevolence as men, he could not, consistently with his principles, love men whom he believed to be "enemies to the cross of Christ." Christians should be united, not only "in the same mind, but in the same judgment." It was impossible he could have a cordial affection for one whose opinions were at perfect antipodes with his, and whose creed did not constitute him a Christian. The Synod professed to regard the Scriptures, and he called on the members to perform their duty to the Head of the Church. Again, he opposed them, because they were not fitted to remove the evils complained of—the plaster was not co-extensive with the sore; because they offered a direct and gross insult to our Arian friends. You are directly requiring them to violate their consciences, and thus you are insulting them; but he (Mr. B.) had too great a respect for them to treat them in any such manner; and, lastly, he wished to be regarded by Arians as an honest man; and how should he be so, if he were not desirous of a separation? They did not, he knew, attach the same importance to truth that he did; but let them put themselves in his situation, and let them say whether he could be honest if he did not urge a division.

Mr. JOHN HOGG (of Carlan) supported the amendment, as conducive to the peace of the Synod.

Mr. N. ALEXANDER (Crumlin) declared himself an enemy to all human creeds, tests, and confessions, as fetters upon the free soul of man, the inventions of men, for which they can find no authority in the Scriptures. I am not an Arian, (said Mr. A.) but, after carefully perusing the word of God, and after much reading on the subject, from my youth till the present time, I am an Anti-Trinitarian. I not only oppose this test, because I cannot find it in the Scriptures, but I oppose all human tests, as assumptions of infallibility and reliques of Popery. All the grounds of scriptural exclusion are impenitent iniquity, and

not loving the Lord Jesus Christ, and, of course, not obeying his law of love to man. Tests are either agreeable to the word of God, or they are not. If they are agreeable to the word of God, they are superseded by the superior word of God, and are therefore useless, and to be rejected. If they are not agreeable to the word of God, they are sinful, and therefore to be rejected. Again, no supplements to the word of God (such as tests and confessions) ought to be adopted, unless made by infallible men. Since the time of the apostles there are no infallible men; therefore no such supplements as tests or confessions ought to be adopted. Again, human tests are either intended to be permanently binding, or they are not intended to be so. If they are not intended to be so, they may be changed the day after they are made, and are therefore useless. If they are intended to be permanently binding, they bind those that sign them never to be wiser than they are at present; and, therefore, being a sinful drag on improvement, ought to be rejected. The use of tests implies that the Spirit of God could not foresee, or provide against all future errors, in the Holy Word of God; it is, therefore, a libel on that Spirit. The only test that I can see necessary, then, is a minute examination of our young men on the Scriptures, the only infallible guide given to us in our present state of trial.

The House was then addressed by Mr. F. DILL, in favour of the Amendment; and Mr. Brown, (Tobermore,) against it.

Mr. FLETCHER BLAKELEY (of Moneyrea) spoke to the following effect:—I rise to oppose the amended overture with the best of my ability; and, in doing so, while it is well known that I am no Trinitarian, I wish it to be understood that I am not a disciple of Arius or Socinus. As gross misrepresentations, however, of the sentiments of these persons have been made in this assembly, I may, before I conclude, claim your indulgence in stating them from some authorities that cannot fairly be disputed. This may be deemed a departure from the question; but I do, notwithstanding, pledge myself to keep closer to it than any speaker that has gone before me. And, in pursuing this course, I must forget all popular feelings which have been so frequently and so shamefully appealed to, and speak as if in the hearing of God alone, whose all-seeing eye is every where present. I have heard, Sir, much pompous decla-



mation concerning religious liberty, and the right of private judgment; but as nothing definite has been said, I am at a loss to know whether the gentlemen who have supported the amendment mean their own religious liberty and right of private judgment, or those of their brethren. In either case, I would humbly recommend them to remember one beautiful passage of Scripture: "If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's." Notwithstanding the high-sounding phrases which have been used in connexion with religious liberty, I am surprised that this liberty is so badly understood and so sadly abused. In the exercise of the right of private judgment, I have taken Christ for my Master; and, however much some may be alarmed, I tell you candidly and boldly, that I have *now no liberty to serve other masters*: and I trust, that neither the fear of persecution nor of death shall influence me to break my engagement, and choose Synods or Councils in his stead. "One is my Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren:"—"No man can serve two masters."—Even the apostles, who were divinely inspired, said to the early disciples, "Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy." I have heard long and loud speeches respecting the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a perfect rule of faith and practice; and, if I be not much misinformed, there have been long and loud lectures delivered, by some of my Orthodox brethren now present, to convince the Roman Catholics of the perfection of the Sacred Scriptures for these purposes. But how unaccountably strange is it, that these very gentlemen are attempting to establish, in this place, the very things which they wished to free the Roman Catholics of in another place! It would be a most glorious boast, if their conduct were in unison with their profession; but the gentlemen who are one moment strenuous in urging the importance and sufficiency of Scripture in all matters of religion, are, the next, noisy in advocating the necessity of human creeds and confessions. Be it remembered, that Jesus Christ is, to every humble disciple, not only "the author, but the finisher of his faith." "All Scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works:" not merely furnished,

but *thoroughly* furnished. Besides, if this amended overture contains nothing but what is in the Scriptures, it is superfluous; and, if it contain any thing contrary to the Scriptures, it should be rejected. If any suppose the Scriptures not plain enough to be a rule and centre of union, how shall we mend the matter? Can we express the ideas of Jesus Christ in clearer and better terms than himself? Can we express the ideas of his apostles, who wrote and preached under the inspiration of God, in plainer and better words than they? Can we put our ideas on an equal footing with any of these? Can we improve that which we declare to be perfect? If all the Synods and Councils in the world should make this presumptuous attempt, they cannot have my concurrence. For there can be no medium between an earthly infallible head of the church, and the sufficiency of the word of God: if any such medium can be found, let it be pointed out. No individual in this large assembly dare assume the right of dictating to me in matters of faith; and if no individual will attempt it, how can numbers create the right? You might as well, Sir, think to make an arithmetical sum out of noughts. We must understand the Scriptures before we can make a *rule* by which the Scriptures are to be understood; and yet, according to the views of my brethren on the other side, we must apply that rule for understanding the Scriptures, which we must have understood before it was made! This is evidently most strange and preposterous. If we cannot bind a man's conscience by the divine word of God, no human composition, however excellent, can bind him; and, in proportion as we fix our affections on human and fallible creeds, and tests, and articles, in the same proportion must we forget the divine and infallible creed contained in the Holy Bible. And it is absolute mockery to grant the right of private judgment in the examination of the Bible, and then reproach and injure a man, because he cannot see every passage in the same light as his neighbour, who is as liable to err as himself. It has been said, that the object of human creeds is to establish *uniformity*. When and where, Sir—in what church or country or kingdom has this uniformity been established? Attempts without number have been made, and they have all failed. The celebrated Lord Chatham, when speaking in his capacity as a senator, said of one of the most learned churches in the world, "We have a Calvinistic

creed, a Popish liturgy, and an Arminian clergy." There may be a pretended uniformity,—there may be an usurped authority, which may injure the best feelings of our nature, and hurt the best charities of life. But what want of uniformity has been exemplified in the supporters of human tests and standards, and of this strange and unexpected overture, may be seen, before we conclude, by appeals to the living and the dead. Before I proceed to notice this pretended uniformity, I beg leave to notice the singular sentiments of my friend, Mr. Barnett, for whose head and heart I have a high regard. He has urged the great dangers of Arianism, and the great advantage of a church being of the same faith,—of one mind. How strange is it that Mr. Barnett left a church professing to be of one mind, and volunteered in uniting himself to one where there is such a variety of opinion, and in which there are so many dangers! (Hear, hear, from all quarters.) I say to him, if he be so much alarmed, repent and return to that church pretending to uniformity. I am utterly astonished at the expressions of Mr. Francis Dill, in referring to the Confession of Faith as the ancient standard of this church. He has pleaded his youth in asking for information; but I must tell him, and in doing so I do not wish to wound his feelings, nor those of any other individual in this large assembly, that, on account of his age, I wonder at his ignorance. This church, I tell him, was long established before the Confession of Faith was compiled, and even before the present translation of the Scriptures was made. I might have referred him to the sexton of my congregation for information on these particulars. I thank you, Sir, for your indulgence, and I shall now proceed, under your protection, to give some authorities to prove the shamefulness of the attacks that have been made upon me and my friends, and how fruitless have been the attempts at uniformity among Trinitarians themselves. I am asked to name my authorities, and I reply, that I shall be happy to lend the original works to any gentleman who calls the authorities in question.

[Mr. B. then read some extracts illustrative of the opinions of Unitarians, and shewing the strange and extensive diversity of Trinitarian interpretations, and proceeded as follows:]

Besides the authorities which I have now quoted, to prove the *want of uniformity* of faith among those who have

subscribed the same human tests, I must acknowledge, Sir, that I am ashamed to notice the strange, paradoxical, and contradictory arguments that have been advanced, by different orthodox members, against Arians, Socinians, and Unitarians. I must assert, and I do it with humility and charity, that they are utterly unacquainted with the systems to which they have referred. In Dr. Evans's well known Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World, under the article on Arianism, it is stated, "Arius owned Christ to be God in a subordinate sense, and considered his death to be a propitiation for sin. The Arians acknowledge that the Son was the *Word*, though they deny its being eternal; contending, that it had only been created prior to all other beings. Christ, say they, had nothing of man in him, except the flesh, with which the Logos, or Word, spoken of by the Apostle John, was united, which supplied the rest. The Arians, though they deny that Christ is the *eternal God*, yet they contend against others for his *pre-existence*. His pre-existence they found on the two following passages among many others:—'Before Abraham was, I am;' and the prayer of Jesus—'Glorify me with that glory which I had with thee *before* the world began.' These, and other texts of a similar kind are, in their opinion, irrefragable proofs that Christ did actually exist in another state before he was born of the Virgin Mary, in the land of Judea." But, without longer detaining you on this point, one of our brethren, notwithstanding their boasted uniformity, says, we are Atheists,—that is, having no God: another says, we are Deists,—that is, having a God; and, however unaccountable it may be, Mr. Elder, whose age obliges me to respect him, has said, we are both Deists and Atheists,—that is, having at the same time a God and no God. One orthodox member says we deny Christ; another says we believe in Christ: the former says, that we rest for salvation upon the merit of our own good works, though he should know that, without exception, we trust for salvation to the free, unpurchased mercy of Almighty God, as revealed in his word. The latter charges us with denying good works, though he should remember that disgraces and degradations have been confined to his orthodox brethren. (Order, order.) Yes, confined to his Trinitarian friends. To crown the uniformity, an aged member has, in his own peculiar manner, called us infidels, though he



expects to meet us in heaven. I must again, Sir, mourn, and lament, and deplore, that men, professing Christianity—that ministers of the gospel, and who have had opportunities for obtaining information, should expose themselves by making such rash and erroneous statements. This moment, one, judging by the inhabitants of our bleak mountains and sequestered glens, tells us, that we are decreasing. The next, another, judging by the five hundred Unitarian congregations of England, and the one thousand of America, and which have been erected in less than fifty years, talks of danger with alarm. I tell these gentlemen, that, were all the Arians and Unitarians of the island flung to the north star, they cannot prevent men from judging for themselves. Mr. John Brown has had recourse to arithmetic as an argument in favour of his cause; and, if he wish, according to his own observations, to be influenced by numbers, he should pass from Presbyterianism into the Church of England, and from that into the Church of Rome,—where he may add the Virgin Mary to the number of his Gods. It is more than marvellous that he should have recourse to the arguments of numbers being on his side, when he must be aware that the history of science, and the history of religion, puts this claim of the majority to the blush, and shews that the propagation of Christianity was the work of *individual minds*, in opposition to the will and wishes of the *multitude*;—that Copernicus and Gallileo advanced philosophy under a persecution which was popular;—and that Luther, and Calvin, and Zuinglius, brought on the Reformation, when opposed by the great mass of the people. Even the hatred of one Trinitarian Church to another has been pressed forward as an evidence and a zeal to prove the truth of the Trinity: and, I must say, if railing will pass for criticism, reproach for argument, and contradictions for proof, that to these gentlemen I freely yield the victory. *They* may appeal to the public feeling; *we* appeal not from Festus to Cæsar; but from man to God. And, I add, that I have, in some measure, been confirmed in my present views by the immoralities of Trinitarians, and rejoice in having brought persons to the table of Christ, who were driven almost into unbelief by the crimes and creeds of the orthodox. What now, Sir, shall be said of this boasted uniformity? On my right hand, I see Calvinists with their five points; on my left, I see Arminians

with their opposite five points, and claiming, on both sides, the names Orthodox and Evangelical. Nay, more—much more: they all lay claim to the influence of the Holy Spirit. Were not this a mere pretence, we should have a sure and safe guide to uniformity. But one orthodox spirit is frequently at variance with another orthodox spirit, though both the spirits pretend to be of God. They may pretend what they please; but as for us, we must return to Moses in the Law, and to Christ in the Gospel. Personal piety is mentioned in the amended overture, and is, undoubtedly, of great moment. But to those who wish to encourage it in others, I would respectfully remark, that humility is the first lesson which we learn from diligent reflection, and self-distrust the first proof we give of having obtained a knowledge of ourselves. I could speak many hours on the question before the House, but am aware that your time is too precious to claim such indulgence. I invite, however, any of my orthodox brethren to meet me with his Bible in his hand, and discuss with me the important points at issue.

Mr. MONTGOMERY then rose, and spoke to the following effect:—Moderator, two circumstances render it difficult for me to arrange and conduct my arguments upon the important question now before you, in the manner which I could desire: the first is, the difficulty of catching and reducing into order the desultory reasonings of my opponents; and the second, that many of the remarks which I intended to introduce, have been anticipated by those on my own side of the House. I shall, however, proceed with as much regularity as circumstances permit, and fearlessly lay before you my sentiments upon a subject involving not merely the character and stability of this church, but likewise the interests and influence of Christianity itself.

I shall set out upon a principle which I consider to be unassailable; viz. that religion is entirely a matter between man and his Creator, excepting so far as one human being may lawfully endeavour to influence another by friendly counsel and instruction. Farther than this, no earthly power has a right to extend: to one Master alone, all are accountable; and as no man can stand in my place, to answer for my principles and conduct before the tribunal of my Judge, I shall never regulate my views of Divine Truth by the opinions of fallible mortals, nor permit them to interfere with that faith

which is to direct my conduct, and to hallow my heart. For instruction, if I be in error, I would be grateful; with courteous admonition, I would not be offended; but to authoritative decisions I never shall submit,—for I should thereby renounce the unalterable allegiance which I owe to the sole King and Head of the Church.

It has been said, “that Arians hold that there is *nothing essential* in Christianity.” If this assertion has been made in ignorance, I pity the persons that have used it; if in wickedness, and with a deliberate purpose of misrepresentation, I hope that I can forgive them. I am bound, however, to say, that it has not a shadow of foundation in truth. So far from alleging that there is *nothing essential* in Christianity, we distinctly hold *every thing* to be essential which God has been pleased to reveal. But I shall tell you what we do say,—that those doctrines, concerning which there have been interminable and bitter controversies amongst Christians, cannot be the *Fundamentals of Religion*. We rest this opinion upon the most profound veneration for the all-perfect and adorable character of the Supreme Being. We believe, that, in all things, he can adapt the means which he employs to the ends which he desires to promote: we feel satisfied that he could have no difficulty in suiting the language of his Revelation to the capacities of those for whose benefit it was communicated: and we necessarily infer, that no principle can be fundamental which is not explicitly revealed. I would put it to my opponents to say, what conception *they* must form of the justice and benignity of God, who aver that he has left matters essential to the salvation of his creatures in such a woful state of uncertainty, that scarcely two men can agree in their explanation of them. Would not this be to impeach both the wisdom and goodness of the Deity, and to render him accessory to the destruction of his people? And that the doctrine of the Trinity is one of a very doubtful character, I can easily prove from the variety of opinions entertained upon the subject, even by the orthodox themselves. The copious extracts read by my friend Mr. Blakeley, from the works of the most eminent divines of the Established Church, amply testify, that amongst them there is no unity of sentiment: and in a volume lately published by one of the most intelligent members of this Synod, the doctrine of the Trinity is freely admitted “to be a

doctrine of *inference*, and not of *explicit revelation*.” Mr. Carlisle was too ingenuous to contend for triumph instead of truth; and he has candidly admitted, what a determined controversialist would have kept out of view. Whilst we hear on all sides, in this House, that the Trinity is *the* fundamental doctrine of Christianity, he freely admits, “that he would not place a doctrine of inference upon an equality with one of explicit revelation.” With him, therefore, there must be other doctrines of superior importance; for, certainly, there are many expressly revealed. But in the conduct of the orthodox members of this Synod, last year, at Strabane, we have an irresistible proof, that they were not agreed amongst themselves regarding their assumed fundamental principle. After disputing for hours about substance, and essence, and person, they were at length compelled to adopt a sentence from the Shorter Catechism, about the terms of which no two of them agreed: and when the whole affair was over, one of them very gravely said to another, “*Your orthodoxy is not my orthodoxy.*” Yet, in the face of all these facts Mr. Eller had yesterday the hardihood to assert, “that no man could read a chapter in the Bible without seeing the doctrine of the Trinity clearly revealed.” If the matter be so *very* clear, is it not strange that he did not point out to his brethren the mode of expressing the doctrine in the *language of Scripture*? Such a step would have been courteous to them, and charitable to us: for, in that case, we would have cordially joined in their declaration.

That the doctrine of the Trinity may be one which, as Mr. John Brown asserts, the most ignorant persons can most easily embrace, I do not pretend to deny. Presumption is a natural consequence of ignorance. Vanity of heart, unchastened by accuracy of judgment, has led to the most arrogant assumptions. It is not when men are illuminated by the spirit of Divine truth, that they presumptuously dictate creeds to their brethren, but when they are blinded by their own prejudices and passions. The wise and the enlightened are always distrustful of their own judgments; whilst the weak and the uninstructed are almost universally positive and dogmatical.

The fact is, it was this ignorant vanity of man which first led to human interference in matters of faith, obscured the lustre of Divine truth, and paved the way for all subsequent corruptions. In



the apostolic ages, when there was no creed but that which came from on high, when there was no interference with opinions save "the counsels of love," Christianity went forth in its native purity and simplicity, captivating the hearts and adorning the lives of men. But the moment that earth attempted to patronize the religion of heaven, the moment that the Empire of Rome took Christianity under its protection—that moment corruptions commenced, "the fine gold became dim." Priests and governors dictated modes of faith and forms of worship; and, in order to sanction the assumption, laid claim to infallibility, in determining the counsels of Heaven. Under this pretence arose a power more extensive and more terrible than any that ever influenced the destinies of the world—a power that equally held in thralldom the cottage and the palace; that almost extinguished the light of literature and science; that took away much of the genuine substance of religion, and left but shadowy forms and ceremonies in its room. The argument of the *majority* having a right to coerce the *minority*, was urged with equal justice then as it is now: might constituted right, whilst racks, and dungeons, and flames, confirmed her decisions, and preserved uniformity.

Upon what principle was it first attempted to change this scene of things? Why, upon the simple and rational and scriptural principle, that every man has an inalienable right to take up his Bible, and to form his own conclusions regarding the things which belong to his duty here and his prospects hereafter. Upon this immutable principle the Reformation commenced; and happy would it have been for the world had it continued as it began. But, alas! the leaven of Popery has been more or less infused into every church. No sooner did Protestants acquire power, than they began to trench upon Christian liberty; they wrested the scourge from the Church of Rome, in order to apply it to the backs of their brethren; they wrote creeds, appointed ceremonies, and connected civil interests with religious professions, until every division of the Protestant Church exhibited a miniature of the great establishment from which it had dissented. The right of private judgment, indeed, was still talked of, and even praised, as I have heard done in this house, by those that are treading it in the dust; but with such persons, it consisted then, as it does now, in exercising the right to judge both for *themselves*

and for *others*. To assist Mr. Morell, and those who glory in the licentiousness with which you trample upon your own laws, I shall quote a passage from the *Code of Discipline*, to enable the world to form some judgment of the distinguished discrepancy which exists between your principles and your practice. The power possessed by the teachers of the church amounts to no more than this, to search the mind of the Spirit speaking in the Scriptures, and to produce the scriptural authority for what they teach. It is the privilege, the right, and the duty of every man to examine the Scriptures for himself; but in exercising the inalienable right of his own judgment, the Christian does not refuse to admit light, or to receive assistance from his teachers: he only refuses to acknowledge subjection to any authority but the word of God; and before he assent to any doctrine, he claims the right of examining the Scriptures for himself, that upon their authority he may rest fully persuaded in his own mind. Holding out these incontrovertible principles, you claim the praise of liberality, "you keep the word of promise to the ear;" but, acting in direct opposition to them, "you break it to the hope." You may speak of the Church of Rome as you will, but, in comparison with you, she is honourable and consistent. She claims infallibility, and consequently denies the right of private judgment; but with a monstrous inconsistency, you admit your fallibility, whilst you demand a submission which nothing could authorize you to claim but an absolute freedom from the very possibility of error. I do ask, in sober sadness, how any class of Protestants can acquit themselves to their own consciences and the world, who assert that their brethren have a right to search the Sacred Records, and to deduce from them their own conclusions, whilst at the very same moment they endeavour to curtail their privileges, and to put them to serious inconvenience for the mere exercise of their natural and Christian rights!

I do aver that your whole overture is directly opposed to the first principles of the Reformation—the right of free inquiry, without penalty or privation. Should it be passed into a law, not a single student can be educated, or licensed to preach, without risk of injury and submission to human authority in matters of faith. If you persevere in this measure, you should change the whole system of education for your can-

didates. Instead of prescribing, as at present, an extensive course of ancient and modern literature, previous to their entering college, and several years' study of philosophy and science, subsequently to their entrance, in order to enlarge their views and increase their capacity for forming accurate judgments, you should limit their education and cramp their understandings, lest they be led to incur penalties by venturing to think for themselves. And when they enter the theological class, instead of directing their attention to the *Bible*, as the rule of their faith, and the anchor of their hopes, your professor should advise them to study nothing but "the accredited standards of the orthodox churches," by which their competency for teaching is eventually to be determined. Besides all this, he ought studiously to conceal from their view the progress of Christianity, and the various sects that have arisen in the church, lest some heresy, such as Arianism, should appear to their minds as rational and as scriptural as Calvinism itself. This would be the honest and manly course to pursue. No false ray of light would shoot across their minds from too free an inquiry into the meaning of the Scriptures; they would be taught to build their faith upon the *safe* foundation of the "Accredited Standards," and in all things they would be well prepared for due submission to their spiritual guides. But to enlarge and disenfranchise their minds, as you do at present, by literature, philosophy, and science; to tell them that the *Bible*, and "the *Bible ALONE* is the religion of Protestants," that they are bound to study it, and have a right to form their own opinions of its doctrines—to do all this, and much more, to produce a manly and independent mode of thinking, and then to turn round upon them in the end, and to expel them from your church, if all their views do not precisely accord with yours—to act in this manner is surely equally tyrannical and unjust. Their time, their toil, their means of support,—all are lost; because you have taught them to *think*, and they have chanced to think differently from you!

These overtures, however, would not only impose a virtual subscription to human interpretations of Scripture, which may, or may not, be agreeable to the word of God; but they would impose this submission to man's authority, in a form more objectionable than was ever proposed in the darkest

ages of the church. Were a candidate for the ministry obliged to subscribe the *Thirty-nine Articles*, or *The Confession of Faith*, he would, at least, be able to make up his mind, and to ascertain the full extent of the sacrifice required of him: but in coming before your projected Committee for license, he would be subjected to an ordeal for which no human being could make due preparation. He would be exposed to the caprice of a many-headed monster; having as many opinions as members; all living in jealousy and collision with each other. No matter into what pliancy he might school his conscience, it would be almost impossible for him to escape. He might as well sail between Scylla and Charybdis, as hope at once to please Mr. Johnston, the smooth Arminian, and that staunch Calvinist, Dr. Wright. Whilst attempting to gain favour with the one, he would require to cast a side-long glance at the other; and also to watch the various minor movements of the extraordinary beings to whose humours his destiny in life must be in a great measure subjected. But, bad as this is, it is not the worst. This strange compound will necessarily change its features every year; so that at one time the majority of its faces may wear the stern, unbending lineaments of Calvinism, and at another, the softer looks of liberal Arminianism. I am not much inclined to submit to human authority; but were I compelled to do so, I should much prefer placing myself under the power of the Pope, to coming under the controul of your projected Committee. I might study the character and accommodate myself, in due time, to the caprices of an individual; but to the ever-changing medley of passions, and prejudices, and opinions, of which your Committee must necessarily be composed, no man could ever be conformed. The only consolation which I enjoy in contemplating this ecclesiastical monster is, that as it is not similar to any thing that ever existed in air, or earth, or sea, I am fully convinced that in its own turbid and jarring elements, it will carry the seeds of its dissolution, and speedily pass away from the world.

One argument much relied upon by our opponents is, that every society has a right to make laws for the government of its own members, and for the admission of others to its privileges. There is some plausibility, but no solidity in this. No society has any right to make a subsequent law in violation



of a previous compact. Now, the projected overture would be a direct infringement of those liberal regulations under which we entered the Synod of Ulster; and if you take from us any power or privilege which we then enjoyed, you are guilty of a gross breach of faith. So much for your power of making laws affecting those already in your body: and now a few words respecting those who claim admission. On this point I assert that you have no power to make any laws, but such as are in accordance with the clear and express word of God. The Lord Jesus Christ is the King of his Church, the Bible is its constitution, and we are subjects bound to obey the laws of his kingdom. Our sole business, therefore, is, to regulate our conduct by the laws contained in the Statute-book; for it is evident that we have no right to alter any law, either to benefit ourselves or to injure others. Upon this principle I shall amply prove, that you have no right to refuse admission to any individual of sufficient attainments, and irreproachable life, who holds such religious opinions as I entertain. "To the law and to the testimony," I bring the matter for trial; and I refer you to the Acts of the Apostles, viii. chapter, and 37th verse. You will there find the terms on which the Ethiopian was admitted to baptism by the Apostle Philip. "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest be baptized: and he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*: and Philip baptized him." Now, does not every Arian believe this with all his heart, and will you dare to refuse admission into the Synod of Ulster to men who would have been admitted to the holy ordinance of baptism by an inspired follower of the Lord? I refer you farther to the 1st Epistle of John, iv. chapter, where you will find explained the manner in which we are to *try* the spirits of men. "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that *Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come into the world." But where is the Arian who does not most joyfully and most gratefully confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh? Yet, in direct opposition to God's word, and to their own know-

ledge, some of our brethren have had the hardihood to brand us in a public journal with the appellation of "Antichrists, and Men of Sin." I now call upon those ministers and that journal to retract the groundless calumny which they have circulated against men, to say the least, as respectable and as Christian as themselves! I shall only refer to one passage more, (though I might easily multiply quotations,) to prove that, according to Scripture, we are entitled to the same privileges as any other members of this church. The passage is 1 John iv. 15: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." Could language be stronger than this? And yet, although holding my opinions, solemnly *confessing that Jesus is the Son of God*, the Spirit of God may dwell in me to enlighten my understanding and sanctify my heart, Mr. Elder and Mr. Dill have the modesty and good feeling to allege, that I am not holy enough to associate with *them*! I put it to you, "fathers and brethren," is it honest, is it seemly, is it Christian in you, to prescribe stricter terms of communion than those appointed by the Spirit of God, or to put men to inconvenience for maintaining opinions which would have gained them free admission into the churches of the apostles?

But it has been asked by Mr. Morell, "Where shall we stop? Shall we admit all professing Christians, Socinians, Catholics, &c.?" I answer: We should just stop with our guide,—with the Holy Scriptures. If we go one step farther, we shall be involved in the mazes of conjecture; and, endeavouring "to become wise above what is written," we shall be lost in endless perplexity and doubt. Upon this ground I would refuse to hold communion with those churches that have "decreed rites and ceremonies" not prescribed in the word of God; because these are "the inventions of men," and I know that woe is denounced upon those who add to the Scriptures or detract from them. To shew that my opinions on this subject are countenanced by eminent authority, I shall give a short extract from two distinguished writers. In proposing to do this, I know that I shall subject myself to the sneer and cant of modern times, which would represent learning and talent as incompatible with a knowledge of Divine truth. In one of those miserable inflammatory productions, with which the country is inundated at present, the author says, "He would

value the opinions of Milton, Newton, and Locke, no more than that of *three idiots!*" I do not envy the intellect which, puffed up by overweening vanity, could undervalue the opinions of a Newton, whose gigantic mind unfolded the laws of nature; or those of a Locke, who explored the mysteries of the human understanding with unrivalled skill and power. I would not, however, idolize intelligence, though I would profit by its assistance; just as I would read a commentary to assist me in understanding an obscure text. The first of the authors from whom I shall read a short passage, is the illustrious Chillingworth—a name dear to Protestantism and to truth. "It is this presumptuous imposing of the senses of men upon the words of God, the special senses of men upon the general words of God, (and laying them upon men's consciences together, under the equal penalty of death and damnation,) this vain conceit, that we can speak of the things of God better than in the words of God; *this deifying our own interpretations*, and enforcing them upon others; this restraining of the words of God from that latitude and generality, and the understandings of men from that liberty wherein Christ and his apostles left them, which is, and hath been, the only fountain of all the schisms of the church, and that which makes them immortal; the common incendiary of Christendom, and that which tears into pieces, not the coat, but the bowels and members of Christ; *ridente Turca nec dolente Judæo*. Take away this persecuting, cursing, and damning of men for not subscribing to the *words of men* as the words of God; require of Christians only to believe Christ, and to call no man master but him only; let those leave claiming infallibility that have no title to it, and let them that in *their words disclaim it*, disclaim it likewise in their actions; take away, I say, this tyranny, and restore Christians to their just and full liberty of captivating their understanding to Scripture only; and as rivers, when they have a free passage, run all to the ocean, so it may well be hoped, by God's blessing, that universal liberty thus moderated, may quickly reduce Christendom to truth and UNITY."

To the same purpose we find the opinion of Locke:

"But if they say that the articles which they require to be professed are consequences *deduced* from Scripture, it is undoubtedly well done of them who believe and profess such things as seem

unto them so agreeable to the rule of faith. But it would be very ill done to obtrude those things *upon others* unto whom they do *not* seem to be the indubitable doctrines of the Scripture. And to make a separation for such things as these, which neither are, nor *can* be, fundamental, is to become *heretics*. For I do not think there is any man arrived to that degree of *madness*, as that he dare give out his consequences and *interpretations* of Scripture as divine inspirations, and compare the articles of faith that he has framed according to his own fancy with the authority of Scripture."

Yet this madness, which Locke thought scarcely possible, is now looked upon by many as the perfection of human wisdom.

Mr. Barnett has inquired in the language of Scripture, "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" I would just ask him, "Agreed in what?" Is it in faith, in all the shades of doctrinal opinions, and in all their views of church government? If this be his interpretation of the text, I would advise him instantly to leave that orthodox seat in which he is now sitting; for there is not in it a single man who, in all points, agrees with him; nor probably any two that agree with each other. Surely, then, the agreement required cannot be Mr. Barnett's visionary one, but a real, practicable unity; a unity of kind affections and forbearance; a unity of design to promote the glory of God and the salvation of sinners. I admit, however, that there is a very powerful bond of union amongst our opponents, in one sense. They have agreed to lay aside all their own points of dispute for a season, and to concentrate their forces for a joint effort against the unfortunate Arians. Dr. Wright, although he says, "it cuts him to the heart to think that there is an Arminian in this Synod," nevertheless joins "hand in hand" with Mr. Johnston and other known Arminians, to make war upon the common enemy. This shews great prudence. The Goths and Vandals of old united in over-running Italy; and when they had accomplished their primary design, they fought with each other for the spoil. So will it be with you; when you have subdued us, you can turn your arms against one another to prevent them from rusting through inaction; and in the end we may have many divisions.

There is one consideration which I would most earnestly and solemnly press



upon you, my brethren, on the opposite side; and I think I shall not press it in vain. You all admit that you are fallible and sinful as individuals; and you admit, that no possible combination of fallibles could make an infallible: for although, in chemistry, amalgamation frequently changes the nature of substances, yet in church courts, I believe it will be found that the mass will partake of the same properties as the different ingredients which compose it. Is it not then possible, with all your confidence in the soundness of your own conclusions, that you *may be wrong*; that you may, at this moment, be giving all the weight of your influence to perpetuate *error*; and that "haply you may be fighting against God," at whose tribunal you will one day be answerable for the measures which you are now taking to arrest the progress of the truth! If this be *possible*, if, from the nature of man, it be exceedingly *probable*, I do beseech you, for your own sakes and ours, to follow the advice of Gamaliel: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this work and this counsel be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, you cannot prevail against it." It sounds very well to talk of "supporting the cause of God and truth;" but you should remember, that this is taking for granted the very subject of dispute, viz. whether truth really *be* on your side. If it be, God will sustain his own cause, without such violent efforts on your parts. The mole that raised a hillock to support a fortress was less presumptuous than men, when they speak familiarly of protecting the cause of Heaven. I entreat you rather to attend to the great Christian principle "of doing unto others as you would that they should do unto you." Now, suppose that at this moment the majority of this Synod were Arians, and that the tide of popular feeling was flowing as strongly in their favour as it is now doing in yours; I ask, would these circumstances convince you that you were in error? No such thing: you would be then as satisfied of the truth of your opinions as you are at this moment. How then would you feel were we to take such steps as you are now pursuing, to eradicate your opinions, to fill your pulpits with Arian ministers, to expose conscientious Calvinists to inconvenience, and to prevent any orthodox young man from receiving licence to preach? Would not the whole kingdom resound with the voice of your just complaint and indignation?

All we ask, then, is even-handed justice: let our opinions have fair play; let young men be licensed with their true characters, and let the people choose or reject them as they think it right.

There is nothing more remarkable than the direct opposition which often exists between the words and the actions of men. This contrast is peculiarly manifested in religion. The right of private judgment is a pleasing and fertile theme at controversial meetings, and at Bible Societies, where all sects meet together, as they ought to do. But let the declaimers come into another situation, and the very right which they so strenuously pressed upon Catholics, they will deny to Protestants; and the Bible which they put into men's hands, without note or comment, they will declare to be inadequate to lead them to salvation, unless they adopt their views of its doctrines. In the same manner they speak most humbly of themselves, disclaim about the weakness and fallibility of man, and then act in a way which nothing but immediate inspiration could justify. I have been led to these observations by a statement of Mr. Barnett, who said that he would admit no man to the Lord's table that did not think as *he* did on doctrinal subjects. I never heard any sentiment with more pain. If Mr. Barnett be, as he will freely admit that he is, a fallible and sinful man, I would seriously ask him, how he dares to stand between any man and his Redeemer, and to render his opinions the standard by which to measure all who desire to become "soldiers of the cross"? It may be, in this uncertain world, that an individual rejected for no moral offence, but simply for supposed error of opinion, should never have another opportunity of testifying his faith and his love by a devout communion; and I do appeal to Mr. B. whether he can altogether enjoy the approbation of his own mind in reflecting, that he has prevented an individual so circumstanced, from strengthening his hope, confirming his repentance, and, perhaps, closing his eyes in peace!

Mr. Cooke says, that "we should all wear the same livery." Now, I hate livery, because it is a badge of subjection to man. The livery of sects creates as much disturbance as the livery of parties. And, after all, outward conformity by no means implies internal resemblance. Even externally, however, Mr. Cooke's friends will wear but a motley aspect: the collar, and perhaps

the sleeves of their livery may be the same, but the body and the skirts will be as patched and diversified as the pantaloons of harlequin. Stern Calvinism, moderate Calvinism, Arianism, and many fainter shades of difference, never can present a uniform appearance. Variety, indeed, is the immutable law of nature. If we cast our eyes over this fair earth which we inhabit, how beautifully is it diversified with hill and dale, with lakes and plains, with oceans and continents, with woods and rivers, with the wildness of nature and the richness of cultivation! In all the extended surface presented to the eye, we cannot find two trees, two animals, nor even two blades of grass, exactly alike. And if we turn to the beautiful canopy of Heaven, we perceive that "one star differeth from another star in glory." When I look around upon this assembly, and contemplate "the human face divine," I see the same principle amply recognized in the infinite diversity of features, expression, and intelligence, presented to my view. And, could I penetrate the hearts, and enter the secret recesses of the minds by which I am surrounded, what an endless variety of emotions, and passions, and opinions, should I behold! To attempt, therefore, by human legislation, to produce an absolute agreement in religious sentiments, would be to rise in rebellion against nature, and, consequently, against "Nature's God." Wherever such attempts have been made, and just in proportion as they have succeeded, the beauty and the power of religion have declined. In turning the eye back upon the course of time, what a deep and melancholy gloom broods over those ages in which the power of man imposed creeds and confessions, and daringly interfered with the prerogatives of Heaven! The state of our church, before our late contentions, has been compared to the Dead Sea. The comparison will not stand examination. There was no deadness or stagnation amongst us: there was diversity of mind, but unity of heart: there was an honourable maintenance of our own opinions, and an equally creditable forbearance with regard to the conscientious convictions of others; we met and parted like men and Christians! But, if the proposed measures could succeed, then there would, indeed, be a dead sea of Presbyterianism: inquiry would cease; the salutary agitation of conflicting opinions would be done away; and one unnatural and un-

wholesome calm would reign over the whole extent of your church. But I rejoice in the certainty that this cannot be: there are conflicting elements amongst yourselves; and the various sects with which you are intermingled, will not permit you to stagnate in heartless inactivity.

The proposed measures are eminently calculated to violate the rights of the people. You tell them that the privilege of choosing their own pastors is one of the greatest which men can enjoy; but should your overture pass into a law, this privilege will be only a name. Whatever may be their views of the gospel truth, you will permit them to elect no pastor but one that has been measured by the standard of faith, erected by your Committee. But they may obtain a minister, you say, from the Presbytery of Antrim, or from England. Very true: but will you ordain him? By no means. Then must they lose their bounty, to which, as contributors to the general revenue of the country, they are fairly entitled; and their ministers must be excluded from the important advantages of the Widows' Fund. Now, is it not a monstrous inconsistency to tell the people that they have a right to choose their teachers, and then to inflict upon them a pecuniary mulct for the conscientious exercise of their privileges? I appeal to the representatives of the laity, who have come hither to assist in the passing of laws for the curtailment of our liberties, whether they may not be forging heavy fetters for themselves and their children. That they have an unquestionable right to judge for themselves "in the things pertaining to their own salvation," I most cheerfully admit; but I do put it to their modesty, their discretion, and their Christian feeling, whether, as unlettered men, (which they generally are,) and educated under the influence of strange prejudices, they should attempt to force their opinions upon ministers of the gospel, who have spent a long series of years in education, and reading, and study of the Scriptures, to qualify them for the proper discharge of the duties of their important and awfully responsible situations. I greatly mistake the honest and manly character of the Presbyterian laity if this appeal shall be made to the Elders without effect.

I come now to a very painful but necessary part of my duty, namely, to refute the calumnies uttered against our



opinions by Mr. Elder and others in this house, and which have been most industriously circulated in the world. We have been directly charged with being "no Christians." We shall not fling back the uncharitable denunciation upon our accusers, though we might remind them, "that if any man have not the spirit of Christ," (the spirit of charity and love,) "he is none of his." We appeal from the harsh and prejudiced judgment of our fellow-sinners, to the justice of that God whom we adore, and to the benignity of that exalted Saviour who is the anchor of all our hopes, and who knows that we love him in sincerity and truth. "It is a light thing for us to be judged by man's judgment;" for we know, "that so long as our hearts condemn us not, we may have confidence towards God." To our unjust accusers we would only say, "Judge not, that ye be not judged; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself." It has been said, "that we must look upon our opponents as idolaters." God forbid. We brand none with odious epithets on account of their conscientious belief; we do not consider them idolaters. We believe that they worship as we do, "the one God and Father of all;" and that, in their own minds, they have some way of reconciling the worship of the Trinity with the first great principle of revelation—the *absolute Unity of God*. I have heard nothing but Arian prayers since I came to this Synod; nor, indeed, at any other time. In your devotional exercises, the three Great Beings engaged in the gracious work of salvation, are uniformly kept distinct, save at the very conclusion; and as I know that "none can find out the Almighty unto perfection," I shall never accuse any man of being an idolater, because he does not exactly entertain my views of the Divine nature and perfections. Let others judge me as they will: "I judge no man."

The inconsistency and absurdity of another charge preferred against us, namely, that we are both *Atheists and Deists* at the same time, has been powerfully exposed by my friend Mr. Blakeley. No man acquainted with the meaning of words could seriously bring forward such an accusation; but the object being to inflame the multitude, Atheists and Deists will produce as much mysterious horror as any other terms which they do not understand. It is melancholy, however, to think that Christian

ministers should submit to such arts; for surely the cause of truth cannot be promoted by deliberate misrepresentation; neither is "it lawful to do evil, that good may come."

But, according to Mr. Elder, "we deny the Lord that bought us," and, consequently, are exposed to the penalty of "bringing upon ourselves swift destruction." Such a shocking and unfounded imputation only reflects disgrace upon its author. We know too well the forfeiture attached to denying our Redeemer, to be guilty of such base ingratitude and folly. We know, "that if any deny Him before men, them will he deny before his heavenly Father." We know, "that there is none other name under heaven, given amongst men, whereby we can be saved, than that of Christ Jesus." We look up to him with unbounded gratitude, as "the new and living way by which alone there is access to the Father." He is the hope of our salvation as well as yours. I can say with as much sincerity as any man in this house,

"Jesus, my Lord, I know his name,  
His name is all my boast;  
Nor will he put my soul to shame,  
Nor let my hopes be lost."

Is this "robbing the Saviour of his crown of glory"? Is this "denying the Lord that bought us"? I am almost ashamed to feel indignation against slanders which only merit contempt.

But it seems "we trust for salvation to our own good works." Where Mr. Elder learned this I cannot conjecture; but perhaps his acquaintance with new-light ministers is more extensive than mine. This, however, I do say, that I never knew any man arrogant enough, or rather mad enough, to claim salvation of God as due to his own merits. Alas! Sir, no man can look into his own heart, or trace back the turbid course of his own life, without being deeply sensible that he cannot stand upon his own righteousness in the presence of that infinitely holy Being, "who chargeth even his angels with folly, and in whose eyes the very heavens are not clean." But I shall tell you what we do say; we maintain that principles are only valuable in so far as they lead to practice; and that faith is important only as the forerunner of works. We do not consider that religion consists in an empty name, in a vain and self-righteous profession, in the use of technical theological terms, or in despising others;

but in the discharge of the great duties of piety and morality, by which we honour God and benefit mankind. We believe that *faith* without *works* is of no more advantage to the individual possessing it, than the gold of the miser in his coffers, or a mine of wealth in the centre of the globe. Nay, more; we believe that the faith of the Christian which leads not to virtuous practice, is not merely *useless*, but *destructive*; inasmuch as its possessor neglects duty, "or sins against the light," and thereby "becomes worse than an infidel." We believe that works are not only the *evidence* of faith, but the very *end and object* of faith: in accordance with the whole tenor of the gospel, and the clear design of revelation, which is intended "to turn us from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan unto God." We believe, however, that our works must be sanctified by the motives which faith supplies, and that we cannot approve ourselves to God by either faith or works *singly*, but only by both *united*. In fact, we hold faith, or right principles, to be the foundation, and works, or right practice, to be the superstructure of the Christian edifice; and yet, that after all we *can* do, we are still "unprofitable servants," and must finally rest upon grace alone.

This leads me to notice the last calumny which has been uttered against us by Mr. Elder, "that we put our hopes of salvation in a *mere creature*." Sir, we do nothing of the kind; we rest our hopes of final acceptance with God neither on our own works, nor upon any mere creature, but upon the unbounded mercy and compassion of our Heavenly Father, as revealed unto us in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I trust to the candour and honesty of Mr. Elder and his friends, that they will now retract their calumnies, and endeavour to disabuse the minds of their people by acknowledging their errors and misrepresentations.

Had we escaped with the groundless invective of *plain prose*, we might have considered ourselves happy; but, woe is me!—the artillery of the Muses has been brought to play upon us from the heights of Parnassus; and we are likely "to be damned to everlasting fame," in "immortal verse." A poem, entitled "*The Thinking Fee*," has just burst upon the delighted world. I do not know whether it may most properly be called lyric, epic, or tragic—perhaps it is rather a combination of the beauties of all the three.

Of one thing, however, there can be no doubt, the subject is admirable—for I, myself, am the hero. This precious production, which attacks the right of private judgment with the utmost virulence through many pages, surely cannot be the offspring of an orthodox Presbyterian Minister, as is generally asserted; but must be the child of some Catholic Priest.\* From the beginning of the world until the present time, every villain that has disgraced humanity is represented as having been an Arian. The author should have gone just one step farther back, (as, I understand, he did in a sermon,) and represented the *Father of lies* as the first Arian. He has, however, commenced with *Cain*, who, it seems, was a staunch Arian, and traced the doctrine through every murderer, suicide, robber, and infidel, down to Carlile and Taylor. The majesty of the verse is well suited to the dignity of the subject; the variety of the phraseology is only equalled by the copiousness of the thoughts. In as many pages we find this beautiful stanza *three* times repeated:—

"For in their minds there is a lodgment  
Of all the right of private judgment."

Were it not that time is precious I could read you the whole work with great pleasure. Where all is so unique, and so perfect in its kind, it is difficult to make selections; I must, however, content myself with one passage, which affords a fair specimen of the author's exquisite skill, both in poetry and science:—

"I will illustrate this position  
By Algebraic definition—  
A Deist is an Arian Theist;  
An Arian is a well-cloak'd Deist;  
And every *thinking* Arian Theist  
Is just—a Unitarian Deist;

\* I owe an apology to the Catholic Priesthood for even hinting *ironically* that any one of their body could be guilty of sending forth so base and so talentless a production. Oh, no! oppressed though they have been, by unjust and impolitic laws, the humblest of their fraternity possesses too much Irish *intellect* and Irish *heart* to be the author of such a work. I have never concealed my disapprobation of the Roman Catholic Church; but I always wish to speak as I feel, kindly and respectfully, with regard to my Roman Catholic countrymen.

H. M.



Hence, if you take away the cloak,  
We have the cuckoo plus the gowk,  
And not the leopard minus zebra,  
If you do understand Algebra.  
Or, if your Euclid be in use,  
The square of *Paine's* hypothenuse  
Is equal to a square that's Arian,  
And also one that's Unitarian—  
And thus it is our northern people  
Can measure any Arian steeple."

I would not have noticed so wretched a production (which is equally devoid of taste, of talent, and of truth) were it not that it manifests the spirit of the times. I know that it was carried, in manuscript, into the houses of persons belonging to a most respectable Arian minister; and the author, I have good reason to believe, has disgraced both himself and us by selling it in this very house of worship during our present meeting. I trust, also, that the notice just taken of it may be the means of raising it to a tenth or twentieth edition; for I never saw any production so well calculated to injure the cause which it pretends to advocate.

I have been told that the object of the proposed measures is a friendly one towards us, and designed to prevent a division of this Synod. With some I believe this to be really the object; but, with others, I am persuaded the design is to render us so uncomfortable as to induce us to retire of our own accord, or to remain with you in a state of degradation.—This is not a manly and straightforward course. Were you to commit an open act of aggression, were you to expel us as heretics, we should retire with the advantage of public sympathy; but, by encouraging us to remain, and to give our countenance to what we consider unscriptural and tyrannical regulations, you would eventually degrade us, both in our own estimation and that of the world. To this we can never tamely submit; for we know better what is due to our principles and characters. I may here answer the question put by several of you: "Why then do we remain with you, when you so plainly say you do not like us?" My answer is very simple—We have no dislike to you; although "you have despitely used us." We consider you to be in great, though not in damnable, error; and we are willing to stay with you for a season, in the charitable hope of eventually bringing you round to sound views and scriptural measures. We believe that our opinions are so accordant with right reason and the Word of God, that in the

end they must triumph over error and prejudice; we hope that a "little leaven may leaven the whole lump;" and we shall remain with you so long as there is any prospect of success, in order to do you good. But should our hopes be deceived, and should our consciences tell us that we are wrong to associate with you, I trust we shall know what is due to ourselves, and to the cause in which we are engaged.

One thing has struck me powerfully during this debate, namely, that not one of you has maintained the doctrine of exclusive salvation; whilst many of you have cheerfully admitted that we are respectable men, and that you anticipate the happiness of meeting us in heaven. This is liberal and Christian; but do you not see in what an awkward predicament this liberality places you? It seems our principles are adequate to accomplish the ends of religion in this world—to make us pious and virtuous men; and, what is infinitely more important, to prepare us for happiness hereafter. But, if so, how can you reconcile it with consistency, to act as if those were unworthy to be members of the Synod of Ulster, who are qualified for "the society of the just made perfect!" The truth is, the *heart* often reasons more correctly than the *head*; and I most cordially reciprocate every generous sentiment that has been expressed. I do firmly believe that, through the infinite mercy of God, in his beloved Son, many of us shall meet in a better land, where we shall be astonished at the prejudices, and ashamed of the passions, that have agitated and divided us in life.

I do not know that my brethren on the opposite side will give me credit for sincerity when I say that, for their own sake and the reputation of their creed, they ought not to press these measures; but I do honestly assure them, that the proceedings of last year have brought great suspicions upon many, and excited doubts respecting all. When a man professes to believe a creed which is prescribed to him, under the fear of any penalty, or the hope of any advantage, his sincerity is never above suspicion; but if he freely hold certain views of doctrine without any such inducements no man can doubt his integrity. Lying under no temptation to hypocrisy, he cannot be accused of deceit; he may be wrong, but he is honest. The moment, however, that a large body of men, infinitely diversified in capacities and attainments, profess to believe in one com-

mon standard of faith, that moment doubts and surmisings commence. No one suspects that any member of the Presbytery of Antrim, or of the Independent Church, does not hold the opinions which he professes; but could as much be said for the Catholic Church, the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, or our own Church? It was upon this principle that the celebrated *Bishop Shipley* advocated, in the House of Lords, the repeal of the disgraceful statute which made it felony to impugn the doctrine of the Trinity. "I am not," said he, "afraid of those tender consciences which scruple subscription, or lead men to profess a scanty creed, for I am convinced they believe what they profess; but I do much fear those men that have an extensive faith—who believe every thing, and subscribe every thing." There never was more practical wisdom, nor a greater knowledge of human nature, displayed in the same number of words; and I can assure you, that it is thus many of the intelligent laity, just now, think of the ministers and licentiates of this Church. When you professed less, you got credit for more.

But a still greater evil has arisen from your past proceedings, and must be increased by your present measures—I mean, that the preaching of the gospel has, very generally, been diverted from its legitimate channel. Controversy, controversy, interminable controversy, is the order of the day! Ministers, to remove suspicions from the minds of their people, and to gratify the prevailing taste, are constantly dwelling upon "debatable land," whilst probationers have no hope of success unless they shew themselves powerful in "the strife of words." Even in our own assembly, what has been spoken of since we met—but *opinions*! Not a word about practice; not a syllable about correcting each others' *vices* and *follies*, or reforming the *morals* of our flocks. This is very different from the conduct of "the Great Preacher of Righteousness;" very different from the course prescribed by the orthodox Apostle Paul to his son *Titus*, when he sent him forth as a Messenger of Grace. He did not exhort him to decry morality, or merely preach it occasionally as a sort of decent adjunct to abstruse doctrinal harangues. No; he enjoined him to make virtue the sum and substance of his preaching: "These things I will that you affirm *constantly*, that they which believe in God might be careful to maintain *good works*; for these things are

good and profitable unto men." No doubt he preached as every minister ought to do, "Jesus Christ and him crucified," as the foundation of the sinner's hope, and the ground-work of the Christian's holiness; but he never forgot the end of all preaching,—the restoring of the sinner "from dead works." How different is the prevailing system of public instruction in these latter days! And how awful is the responsibility of those who turn the attention of the multitude from the duties of life to the controversies of men!

In answer to all these arguments, for a milder, a more rational, and a more Christian course of procedure, we are told, "that a great ferment exists amongst the people, and that something must be done to allay it." Very true; a great ferment does exist. The prophetic words of our Saviour, who foresaw that the evil passions of men would pervert the benevolent object of his mission, are fully verified—"I come not to send peace upon earth, but a sword." Were that ancient philosopher alive, who, in the commencement of the gospel dispensation, exclaimed, "Behold how these Christians love one another!" he might now, with equal propriety, ejaculate, "Behold how these Christians hate one another!" But whatever ferment exists, we are not to blame. You kindled the conflagration, and you are bound to extinguish it, without molestation or injury to us. We have broken no compact; we have never interfered with your opinions; we have raised no unjust clamour against you. The existing evils are of your own creation, and you have no right to make us the victims to appease the wrath which you yourselves have excited. The condition of our hapless country is deplorable; the state of our own church is distressing; but my friends and myself are guiltless of these calamities. Let those answer for them who produced them; "we have neither lot nor part in the matter."

How strange it is, that the favoured work of God upon earth is that being in all nature which seems least to answer the design of its creation! I was never more forcibly impressed with this melancholy fact, than upon the evening of Monday last, when travelling over the beautiful district of country between Dungiven and this place. The glorious sun cast his golden mantle over the mountains, and the valleys reposed in shade; the song of cheerfulness ascended



from the peasants at their toil, whilst the children were joyfully collecting fuel for the bonfires and festivities of Midsummer's-eve. As far as the eye could reach, innumerable flocks and herds were browsing in peace upon the green pastures, and the very air was impregnated with myriads of animated beings. Throughout the wide extent around and above me, all was life, and tranquillity, and happiness! Not a single sound of sorrow smote upon the ear, nor a single object of misery passed before the eye. In the midst of that glorious temple of Nature, my soul instinctively ascended in devout aspirations of adoration and gratitude to the benignant Author of such extended and diversified enjoyment. I felt happier in my own existence, and in that of all animated creatures; and I did not believe there was a being upon earth whom such a scene would not have soothed into tranquillity and benevolence. In this, however, I fear I was mistaken; for on journeying on through an ever-varying scene of beauty and happiness, I think I did discover one object uncongenial with the time, and the circumstances, and the place. It was a Christian minister, travelling to this scene of our meeting. His eye dwelt upon me, but not in friendly recognition; his face was towards me, but no smile played upon his features. My heart sunk within me, to think that men, and Christian men, should have been the only beings who, on that glorious evening, were deficient in kindly affections. Oh! surely such things are not congenial with our country, nor with our religion. Nature has given us a fair and fertile abode,—Providence has blessed us with generous hearts and liberal hands,—and the gospel of peace has long been the inmate of our dwellings. Why, then, is our country a universal theatre of contention? Why are Christians of the same communion arrayed against each other? Why? Because men presumptuously interfere with the conscientious belief of their brethren, and spend that time in forming plans of annoyance, which ought to be dedicated to offices of peace!

I do appeal to my brethren whether these be times in which any church, and

especially any Presbyterian church, should occupy itself in devising schemes for the curtailment of Christian liberty? Is it in the nineteenth century, when even Catholicity is evidently relaxing her grasp, when the Established clergy and the Legislature have given a signal proof of the progress of liberal opinions in the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts—is it at such a time, that we should retrograde, and surrender the fundamental principles of our church? If we do, a death-wound will be inflicted upon Presbyterianism; division will follow usurpation; weakness will succeed division: and though individuals may chiefly suffer in the beginning, the church must suffer in the end.

From the excited state of public feeling, and from the observations of many ministers and elders, I think it is evident that we are not, at present, in a proper condition to come to a sound and impartial conclusion upon the important subject before us, which involves the very constitution of our church. I therefore do entreat my brethren to pause, and to allow these weighty matters to lie over for consideration, as enjoined by the salutary regulations of our code of discipline, for at least one year.

[The remainder of Mr. Montgomery's speech, and that of Mr. Stewart which closed the debate, are unavoidably deferred to our next.

Mr. Dill professed to accept Mr. Fletcher Blakeley's challenge, and three gentlemen were nominated by each party to make the needful arrangements. Mr. Dill's friends, however, insisted on the discussion being confined to *six hours*, and refused to have any report of it authenticated, as was proposed, by the joint signature of the parties. The discussion has thus been evaded for the present. The correspondence was published in the Northern Whig of July 24th. In that paper, for August 7, is an admirable letter from Mr. Fletcher Blakeley on a speech delivered by Mr. Cooke, on a subsequent occasion, in reply to Mr. Montgomery. We are glad to learn that a correct account of the debate and the subsequent proceedings is about to be published in the form of a pamphlet.]

## CORRESPONDENCE.

THE Editor of the Monthly Repository has commenced his task under circumstances of difficulty and discouragement; but with that reliance upon the zealous support of his Unitarian brethren which he has always felt, and which has never yet been disappointed. He depends upon their voluntary assistance to render the work a worthy organ of their sentiments. If those who have ability and opportunity will entrust their literary contributions to his care, he does not despair of erecting it into a powerful machine for the promotion of knowledge, truth, liberality, and goodness. He makes this general appeal, in preference to individual applications, because he wishes the Repository to represent fairly and promote efficiently the views of the denomination at large, and not merely those of the comparatively small number of whose services personal friendship might enable him to avail himself. It is his wish that the Monthly Repository should, by the importance, the interest, the power, and the variety of its contents, and the faithfulness, freedom, and liberality of its spirit, verify its title to the honourable character of *the Unitarian Review and Magazine*; and unless it can be made to do so, he, for one, will feel little regret at its extinction. Whenever there has been an important object to be gained by pecuniary means, the Editor has always observed that the Unitarian public, in proportion as the case was clearly and strongly made out, met it with promptitude and generosity: and hence his confidence that intellect will, not less decisively than wealth, reply to demands made in the name of religious truth and liberty. His best thanks are already due to many for their promised continuance in, or accession to, the list of contributors. There are many more to whom he is anxiously looking for valuable and welcome assistance, which he trusts will not be withheld.

The Editor would also remind those who are interested in the success of the Repository, but whom various circumstances may preclude from aiding it by their pens, that its circulation is not, nor has ever been, so extensive as might have been expected from its intrinsic merit, and from the numbers and respectability of the class of readers for whom it is especially designed. They have the opportunity, by promoting its sale in their various connexions, of affording the Editor means (which he would be most happy to possess) for the improvement of the work, and at the same time of furthering the great objects to which its pages are devoted.

Communications have been received from Tv; Paterestiaristos; J. R. Esdaile; and W.

P. will see that his wishes have been attended to. The suggestion of W. T. will be acted upon as a general principle.

The Obituary of Mr. John Rowland, of Boston, came to hand too late for insertion. It will appear next month.

It is requested that all communications be addressed to the Editor, post-paid, at the Monthly Repository Office, 3, Walbrook Buildings, Walbrook.

*Manchester College, York.*

In the Report of the late examination, (see our last Number, p. 569,) it is stated that Mr. H. Hawkes delivered an Oration on the Dramatic Unities, and Mr. Charles Fletcher one on the Necessity of the Christian Revelation; it should have been said, that the former was delivered by Mr. Fletcher (a Lay Student), the latter by Mr. Hawkes (a Divinity Student).